



EUROPEAN
COMMISSION

Community research

EU RESEARCH ON SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HUMANITIES

*Organised civil society
and European governance*

CIVGOV

Interested in European research?

Research*eu is our monthly magazine keeping you in touch with main developments (results, programmes, events, etc.). It is available in English, French, German and Spanish. A free sample copy or free subscription can be obtained from:

European Commission
Directorate-General for Research
Communication Unit
B-1049 Brussels
Fax (32-2) 29-58220
E-mail: research-eu@ec.europa.eu
Internet: <http://ec.europa.eu/research/research-eu>

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Directorate-General for Research
Directorate L — Science, economy and society
B-1049 Brussels
Fax (32-2) 2994462

<http://ec.europa.eu/research/social-sciences>
http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/cooperation/socio-economic_en.html

EU RESEARCH ON SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HUMANITIES

Organised civil society and European governance

CIVGOV

Final report

HPSE-CT-2002-00114

**Funded under the Key Action
'Improving the Socio-economic Knowledge Base' of FP5**

**DG Research
European Commission**

Issued in
May 2006

Coordinator of project:

Department of Sociology and Social Research, University of Trento
Italy
Prof. Carlo Ruzza
www4.soc.unitn.it:8080/dart/content/e1354/index_ita.html

Partners:

Department of Sociology and Social Research, University of Trento, IT, Prof. Carlo Ruzza
Department of Political Science, Universidad del Pais Vasco, ES, Prof. Pedro Ibarra
Programme of European Culture, Hellenic Open University, EL, Prof. Lila Leontidou
CEVIPOF, Paris, FR, Prof. Elisabeth Dupoirier
Department of Political and International Relations, Catholic University of Louvain, BE,
Prof. Lieven De Winter
Department of Sociology, University of Essex, UK, Prof. Ted Benton
Department of Politics, University of Stirling, UK, Dr Peter Lynch
Institut für Sozialwissenschaften, Humboldt University, Berlin, DE, Prof. Klaus Eder
University Etovos Lorand, HU, Prof. Mátè Szabò
Institute of Sociology, University of Silesia, PL, Prof. Kazimiera Wodz
Department of Sociology, Södertörn University College, Stockholm, SE, Prof. Tom Burns
Department of Political Science and Administration, University of Santiago de
Compostela, ES, Prof. Margarita Gomez Reino

***EUROPE DIRECT is a service to help you find answers
to your questions about the European Union***

Freephone number(*):
00 800 6 7 8 9 10 11

(* Certain mobile telephone operators do not allow access to 00 800 numbers
or these calls may be billed

LEGAL NOTICE

Neither the European Commission nor any person acting on behalf of the Commission is responsible for the use which might be made of the following information.

The views expressed in this publication are the sole responsibility of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the European Commission.

A great deal of additional information on the European Union is available on the Internet.
It can be accessed through the Europa server (<http://europa.eu>).

Cataloguing data can be found at the end of this publication.

Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, 2007

ISBN978-92-79-07589-6

© European Communities, 2007

Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged.

Printed in Belgium

PRINTED ON WHITE CHLORINE-FREE PAPER

Preface

Within the Fifth Community RTD Framework Programme of the European Union (1998–2002), the Key Action 'Improving the Socio-economic Knowledge Base' had broad and ambitious objectives, namely: to improve our understanding of the structural changes taking place in European society, to identify ways of managing these changes and to promote the active involvement of European citizens in shaping their own futures. A further important aim was to mobilise the research communities in the social sciences and humanities at the European level and to provide scientific support to policies at various levels, with particular attention to EU policy fields.

This Key Action had a total budget of EUR 155 million and was implemented through three Calls for proposals. As a result, 185 projects involving more than 1 600 research teams from 38 countries have been selected for funding and have started their research between 1999 and 2002.

Most of these projects are now finalised and results are systematically published in the form of a Final Report.

The calls have addressed different but interrelated research themes which have contributed to the objectives outlined above. These themes can be grouped under a certain number of areas of policy relevance, each of which are addressed by a significant number of projects from a variety of perspectives.

These areas are the following:

- ***Societal trends and structural change***

16 projects, total investment of EUR 14.6 million, 164 teams

- ***Quality of life of European citizens***

5 projects, total investment of EUR 6.4 million, 36 teams

- ***European socio-economic models and challenges***

9 projects, total investment of EUR 9.3 million, 91 teams

- ***Social cohesion, migration and welfare***

30 projects, total investment of EUR 28 million, 249 teams

- ***Employment and changes in work***

18 projects, total investment of EUR 17.5 million, 149 teams

- ***Gender, participation and quality of life***

13 projects, total investment of EUR 12.3 million, 97 teams

- ***Dynamics of knowledge, generation and use***

8 projects, total investment of EUR 6.1 million, 77 teams

- ***Education, training and new forms of learning***

14 projects, total investment of EUR 12.9 million, 105 teams

- ***Economic development and dynamics***

22 projects, total investment of EUR 15.3 million, 134 teams

- ***Governance, democracy and citizenship***

28 projects; total investment of EUR 25.5 million, 233 teams

- ***Challenges from European enlargement***

13 projects, total investment of EUR 12.8 million, 116 teams

- ***Infrastructures to build the European research area***

9 projects, total investment of EUR 15.4 million, 74 teams

This publication contains the final report of the project 'Organised civil society and European governance', whose work has primarily contributed to the area 'Citizenship, governance and the dynamics of European integration and enlargement'.

The report contains information about the main scientific findings of CIVGOV and their policy implications. The research was carried out by 14 teams over a period of 34 months, starting in February 2003.

The abstract and executive summary presented in this edition offer the reader an overview of the main scientific and policy conclusions, before the main body of the research provided in the other chapters of this report.

As the results of the projects financed under the Key Action become available to the scientific and policy communities, Priority 7 'Citizens and Governance in a knowledge based society' of the Sixth Framework Programme is building on the progress already made and aims at making a further contribution to the development of a European Research Area in the social sciences and the humanities.

I hope readers find the information in this publication both interesting and useful as well as clear evidence of the importance attached by the European Union to fostering research in the field of social sciences and the humanities.

J.-M. BAER,

Director

Table of contents

Preface	v
Acknowledgements	11
I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	17
1. The relevance of EU regulation	21
2. Budgetary and time constraints	22
3. Mutual expectations of institutional and civil society actors	23
4. Political Opportunity Structure	25
5. Conclusions	28
6. Policy Recommendations	31
7. Dissemination Strategy	32
II. BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES OF THE PROJECT	35
III. SCIENTIFIC DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT RESULTS AND METHODOLOGY	37
1. Work Package 2	39
2. Work Package 3	45
3. Work Package 4	47
4. Findings of Project Workpackages	48
4.1. The Environmental Sector	48
4.1.1. Introduction	48
4.1.2. Organisations and campaigns	49
4.1.3. Public identification and public opinion	58
4.1.4. Strategies, advocacies and opportunities	60
4.1.5. The perception and relevance of EU policy-making	64
4.1.6. Alliances and networks at the EU level	67
4.1.7. Europeanisation of environmental civil society	71
4.2. The Regional Sector – Cultural/Linguistic Minorities	74
4.2.1. Policy History and Significance	74
4.2.2. Nature and Structure of MACs	78
4.2.3. Issues and campaigns	80
4.2.4. Public opinion	81
4.2.5. Strategies	81

4.2.6. Openness/responsiveness of political opportunity structure and level of institutional contact for SMOs	82
4.2.7. Degree of common understanding among SMOs/MACs and with institutional and other relevant actors	83
4.2.8. Relevance of EU policy-making	83
4.2.9. Alliances and networks at EU level	85
4.2.10. General comments on degree of Europeanisation of policy-sector and civil society organisation in sector	86
4.3. The Regional Sector – Structural Policy	86
4.3.1. Introduction	86
4.3.2. Nature and Structure of MACs	91
4.3.3. Issues and Campaigns	96
4.3.4. Public opinion identification with SMOs/MACs	97
4.3.5. Strategies of SMOs/MACs	98
4.3.6. Openness/responsiveness of political opportunity structure and level of institutional contact for SMOs/MACs	98
4.3.7. Common understanding among SMOs/MACs and with institutional actors	101
4.3.8. Europeanisation of policy sector and of civil society involvement	102
4.3.9. Conclusions	103
4.4. The Anti-Racist Sector	104
4.4.1. Introduction	104
4.4.2. Nature and Structure of MACs	106
4.4.3. Issues and Campaigns	110
4.4.4. Public Opinion and Representativeness	112
4.4.5. Strategies	112
4.4.6. Political Opportunity Structure and Institutional Contacts	114
4.4.7. Common Understandings	115
4.4.8. Relevance of EU Policy-Making	117
4.4.9. Alliances and Networks at the EU level	118
4.4.10. Europeanisation	120
4.4.11. Conclusion	122
4.5. Comparative Data Analysis	123
4.5.1. Introduction	123
4.5.2. Forms of mobilisation and participation	123
4.5.3. Participation at local and national levels	124
4.5.4. Participation at the European level	126
4.5.5. Openness and Responsiveness	131
4.5.6. Representativeness	135

4.5.7. European Networks: contacts with umbrella organisations and alliances	137
4.5.8. Conclusions	139
4.6. The EU Level	140
4.6.1. Introduction	140
4.6.2. Political opportunity structures	141
4.6.3. Representativity of EMOs	149
IV. CONCLUSIONS AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS	154
1. Advances on social movements' research	154
1.1. Frame Analysis	154
1.2. Advances on POS perspectives	157
1.3. Social movements and action repertoires	158
1.4. Ritualisation versus policy effectiveness	158
1.5. MACs and coalition theory	159
1.6. Social movement Europeanisation	163
2. The literature on interest groups	163
3. Advances on the literature on civil society	164
4. Policy recommendations	169
4.1. Should Civil Society organisations have stronger decision-making and/or consultative roles?	169
4.2. Support for capacity building: how to allocate resources?	169
4.3. Problems with 'Brussels' relocation of organised civil society	170
4.4. Further recommendations	172
4.4.1. Make accounting more public	172
4.4.2. Implementation of EU legislation	172
4.4.3. Regarding the Policy Sectors	172
5. The collaborative effort of the CIVGOV project	179
6. Future need for research	180
V. DISSEMINATION AND EXPLOITATION OF RESULTS	181
1. Potential for Exploitation of Research	181
2. Relationship with other EU projects	181
3. Contacts with Potential Users	183
4. Planned Project Dissemination Activities	183
VI. REFERENCES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY	188
VII. ANNEXES	193

1. Annex 1. Deliverables	193
2. Annex 2: Publications, Conferences, Seminars, Papers Presented	194

Acknowledgements

The smooth functioning of the CIVGOV project was made possible by the hard work of the CIVGOV co-ordinating team under the Scientific Director Carlo Ruzza. Day to day progress on the project was supervised by the project manager and research co-ordinator Stefano Fella. The data analysis was overseen by Emanuela Bozzini, whilst the EU level of work was co-ordinated by Stijn Smismans. In the final year of the project, Nanette Schuppers joined the team as project assistant, aiding in the closure of the project. Two of the policy sectors were also supervised from within the Trento team: the anti-racist sector by Stefano Fella and Carlo Ruzza; and the Structural Policy sector by Simona Piattoni. Among other partners, the Linguistic/Cultural Minority Regional sub-sector was co-ordinated by Lieven de Winter and the Environmental Sector by Inaki Barcena. Moreover, Hans-Jorg Trenz provided a valuable input to the co-ordination of the European level of work, particularly in relation to national-EU linkages. The co-ordinating team would also like to thank the administrative offices of the Department of Sociology and Social Research who assisted in the correct administration of the project, particularly Monica Pavan, Elena Erbi and Angela Granatiero, and the Jean Monnet Centre of the University of Trento, directed by Riccardo Scartezzini, for housing the project. Last but not least, the completion of the project would not have been possible without the patience and support of the scientific officers of the Commission, Angela Liberatore and Alessia Bursi.

Aside from these particular contributions, all those who contributed to the project's progress within the research teams of the different partners should be acknowledged as identified in the lists below:

Italy (University of Trento)

Carlo Ruzza (scientific coordinator), Stefano Fella (Project Manager), Emanuela Bozzini, Stijn Smismans, Simona Piattoni, Nanette Schuppers, Massimiano Bucchi, Alberto Zanutto, Giuseppe Pellegrini, Giulia Bigot, Duncan McDonnell, Ivan Pedrazzini, Milena Alessia Bigatto, Paolo Pasi, Stefano Pantaleone, Maria Laura Russo, Stefano Petrolini.

Spain (University of Basque Country)

Pedro Ibarra (scientific coordinator), Inaki Barcena (research director), Josu Larrinaga.

Spain (University of Salamanca)

Margarita Gomez.Reino (scientific coordinator), Martino Rubal, Monica Ferrin.

Greece (Hellenic Open University)

Lila Leontidou (scientific coordinator), Alex Afouxenidis, I. Chatzivariti, Kristis Konnaris, Marios Hatjiconstantinou, Pantelis Sklias, Vangelis Stournaras.

France (CEVIPOF, Paris)

Elisabeth Dupoirier (scientific coordinator), Anne Marijnen, Aude Cavail  , Aur  lie de Andrade, Lilian Mathieu, Odette Hatto, Oliver Fillieule, Remi Guillot

Belgium (Catholic University of Louvain)

Lieven de Winter (scientific coordinator), Huri Tursan, Melissa Benoumeur, Regis Dandoy.

England (University of Essex)

Ted Benton (scientific coordinator), Emanuela Bozzini, Katy Wheeler, Paul Iganski, Peter Dickens.

Scotland (University of Stirling)

Peter Lynch (scientific coordinator), Steven Birrell, Claire Lightowler, Bill Paterson.

Germany (Humboldt University Berlin)

Klaus Eder (scientific coordinator), Hans-Joerg Trenz (research director), Erik Jentges.

Hungary (University of Et  tv  s)

M  t   Szab   (scientific coordinator), Gabor Csanadi (research director), Adrienne Csizmady, Kyra Tomay, Lea Koszeghy, Gabor Fleck, Janos Balazs Kocsis, Attila Fonyo, David Hargitai, Katalin Fuleki, Melinda Kovai.

Sweden (S  dert  rn University)

Tom Burns (scientific coordinator), Marcus Carson (research co-ordination), Dave Lewis, Jan-Hendrik Kamlage, Mara Fridell, Peter Wennersten, Rebecca Lawrence, Svante Tidholm, Zenia Hellgren.

Poland (University of Silesia)

Kazimiera Wodz (scientific coordinator), Jacek Wodz, Andrzej Niesporek, Ewa Lesniak-Berek, Krzysztof   lecki, Maciej Witkowski, Marcin Gacek, Witold Mandrysz.

Special thanks should also go for the large number of organisations and individuals who agreed to be interviewed in the course of the research by the 12 different partners. Without their input, this research would never be possible:

France

ACENAS, ACIPA, ACNAT, ADVOCNAR, Agir pour l'environnement, Alsatian Region, Aquitaine region, Association, CFDT, CGT, Chamber of Crafts, Confédération Paysanne, CORIAS, C-PANNET, CTC Region Corsica, Culture et Bilinguisme, DATAR, Dernieres Nouvelles d-Alsace, Diwan School in Paris, FLAREP, France Nature Environnement, Greenpeace France, Greenpeace Toulouse, Info'gm, La Falce, LDH, Le Monde, Le Parisien, Libération, MEDEF Corsica, MRAP, OGM Dangers, OR-CAN, Ras l'Front, Regional Chamber of Commerce, Regional Council Rennes, Regional newspaper - Sud Ouest, SOS Racisme, SUD, Ti Ar Vro, UECNA, UFCNA, UFNASE, University of Rennes.

Germany

Aktion Courage, Aktionsbündnis, Anlaufstelle f. Opfer r-Gewalt, Arbeitsförderungsges, Aric, aufgemUCKt, Ausländerbeirat Frankfurt, Ausländerbeiräte, B.f. Demokratie u. Toleranz, Bayerischer Städtetag, BDB, BI Flughafen Tempelhof, BI gegen das Luftkreuz, BI Pankow ohne Fluglärm, BIF Hallbergmoos, BUND, BUND Bavaria, BUND Hessen, Bündnis der BI Frankfurt, Bündnis90/Die Grünen, BVBB, DGB, DGB Bayern, DGB Berlin-Brandenburg, Diakonisches Werk, Diakonisches Werk Berlin, Domowina, Förderverein Roma, Frankfurter Plenum gegen Rassi, Frauenpolit Rat Brandenburg, Friesenrat, FUEN, Gen-ethisches Netzwerk e.V., Greenpeace, Humboldt Universität zu Berlin, IfOK, IHK Brandenburg, INBAS, Kein Patent auf Leben, Mayor of Flörsheim, Nordfriesischer Verein, Nordfriesisches Institut, Pro Bahn e.V., PRO Flughafen e.V., Prognos, Schutzgemeinschaft Freising-N, SSW, Sydslesvigsk Forening, VBW, Verbraucher Initiative e.V.

Greece

AIWCS, Amnesty International, ARKTOUROS, Ecological Group of Rodopi, Eikastiki Paremvasi, EMTh, EORGON, EPOS, ΕΠΤΠΠ, Friends of the Environment, GAIA Educational Serv, GCR, GreenPeace, HOA, Kidon, KIPSELI, MED SOS, Medecins sans Frontiers, MOM, ODYSSEAS, ΟΙΚΙΠΑ, Oikologiki Etairia, ΟΙΚΟΤΟΡΙΑ, Social Solidarity, SOS Racism, SPATPE, Sunshine, Torture Victims, Turkish Minority Movement, Union of Voluntary Firemen, VIGLA, VOSPOROS, WWF, Ydatinos, Youth Society of Komotini, Zoofiliki Etairia, Κίνηση Πρόσταση, ΠΑΓΓΑΙΑ, ΠΕΡΛΑ, ΣΠΥΠΧ.

Hungary

Amaro Trajo Roma Cult. Foundation, Amrita Association, Amrita Association, Autonomia Foundation, Bhim Rao Association, Biokultúra Egyesület, Collegium Martineum, CSEMETE, CSZMMB, Ec-Pec Foundation, ELTE – PKIK, E-misszió környezetvédelmi egy, Energia Klub, Független Ökológiai Központ, Gandhi Public Foundation, GATE Zöld Klub, Greenpeace, GYMCMCÉSZ, Helsinki Committee, HUMUSZ, INDOK, Institute of Sociology - HAS, Józsefváros School, Kalyi Jag High School, Kerékpárral Közlekedők Ország, Két Kerékpárral Kevesebb Egyesület, KJI, Levegő Munkacsoport, Magyar Közlekedési Klub, Magyar Természetvédők Szövetsége, Magyar Urbanisztikai Társaság, Mahatma Gandhi Organisation, Menedék, Ministry of the Prime Minister, MLKE, MTKSZ, Mus. of Ethnogr, Roma collect., NEKI, Ökológiai Intézet, Ökológiai Intézet a Fenntartha, Ökotárs Alapítvány, Pécsi Zöld kör, PHARE office, Public Association of Roma Women, Raoul Wallenberg Org., Reflex Egyesület, Reflex Környezetvédő Egyesület, Rom Som, Roma New Line, Rügyecskék, SZCDK, Városi Bicyclists Barátai Egyesület, Védegylet, Védegylet - Duna Charta.

Italy

ALEF-CGIL, Amici della Terra, Anolf –CISL, ARCI-Cagliari, ASGI, Assobiotec, Caritas, CCC5, Cestim, Cisl- anolf, Comitato Purliliese, Committee of the Regions, Committee of the Regions for Friuli Venezia Giulia, Committee of the Regions for Sardinia, Confagricoltura, Consiglio Regionale Trentino Alto Adige, Convivia, Cospe, Crocevia, ctm Altromercato, Cultural Association South Tyrol, Dedalus, Dialogo onlus, Editori Sardi, ENAR, ENAR section Italy, Environmental Ministry, Fairuz, Forum dei Migranti, Greenpeace, Italia Nostra, La Carovana 94, Ladins, LegaCoop Sardegna, Legambiente, Lunaria Onlus, Mamme antismog, Marksmen Alliance South Tyrol, Ministero del Welfare – dipartimento Immigrazione, Ministry Equal Opportunities, NAGA onlus, Office Bolzano/Alto Adige, Office for European Integration, Office Friuli Venezia Giulia, Osservatorio Provinciale Immigrazione, Province of Udine, Provincia Autonoma di Bolzano, Provincia di Nuoro, Regione Sardegna, Riserva Marina Miramare-WWF, RUE, Senate of the Republic, Servizio Accoglienza Stranieri, SKGZ, SMG, Società Filologica Friulana, SOS Racisme, Sotziu limba sarda, UIL, Università di Genova, Università di Padova, VAS-Verdi Ambiente Società, Vicini di Casa, WWF.

Poland

Advisory Bureau for Roma, Agency for Local Development, Amnesty International, Association COMPERIO, Association For Regional Development and Cooperation,

Association "Green Silesia", Association Childrens of Holocaust, Association for Walking Rights, Association of Polish Students Green Network, Bureau for supporting eco, CARITAS, Cau Vong, Centre for ecological law, Centre for refugees help, Club "Gaja", Consumer's Federation, Department of Information and Communication, EPNF, European Centre of Sustainable Development of Wrocław, European Parliament, Euroregion Beskidy, Expert, Forum Dialogue Between Nations, Foundation in Support of Local Democracy, Germans socio-cultural society, Gipsy Association in Poland, Green Federation – Kraków, Green Federation – Opole, Greenpeace Poland, Greens Association, Group for Roma and Travellers of Council of Europe, Helsinki Foundation for Human Rights, Institut for Eco-development, Jewish Religious Community, Jewish Religious Community Uni, Mining Communes Association, Ministry for Environment Protection, Ministry of Economy and Labour, Monthly "Śląsk", Never again, Open Republic, Parliament, Permanent Representation of Poland to EU in Brussels, Polish Bureau of Regional and Minority Languages, Polish Ecolog. Club Ruda Śl., Polish Ecological Club Gliwice, Polish Ecological Club Mikołów, Polish Union of Jewish Student, Polish-German Cooperation House, Programme of Humanitarian Educa, Project RIS – Silesia, Public Institut for Ecology, Publishers "Green Brigades", Publishers "Green Brigades", Reconciliation and Future, Regional Chamber of Economy, Robert Schuman Foundation, Silesian Commune and District, Social Initiative Development Centre, Society for the Earth, Stefan Batory Foundation, UNHCR, University of Opole, Uppersilesian Agency, Uppersilesian Association, Viridarium Group, Warsaw University, Weekly "Polityka".

Scotland

Committee of the Regions, Comunn Na Gaidhlig, Cornish Constitutional Convention, Cornish Language Society, Cornwall County Council, East of Scotland European Partnership, Gwynedd County Council, Institute of Cornish Studies, Mebyon Kernow, Scots Language Society, Scottish Committee of European Bureau for Lesser Used Languages, Scottish Parliament Information Centre, Stirling Council, Strathclyde European Partnership, University of Edinburgh, University of Strathclyde.

Spain (Salamanca and Basque Country)

A Mesa Pola Normalización, A Pie. A. Defensa Viandante, ADEGA, AEMC, AS ESPAÑOLA MARI, AHT-Gelditu Elkarlana, Andalucía ACOGE, APDHA, Asociación la Corrala, ATIME, AZRAF, Basque Country University, Basque Government, Batasuna, Bizkaiko Batzar Orokorrak, BNG, CAL, CAR, Catalunya XXI, CCOO, CCOO-Madrid, CEAR, CEG, CIEMEN, CIG, CiU, Conselleria de Pesca, COPALTAV, DANTZAKI taldea, Defensor del Pueblo Andaluz, DG Environment, DG Transport and Energy, EBLUL, Ecologistas en Acción, EEB,

EHNE, ERC, Euskal Herrian Euskaraz, Friends of the Earth, GEA 21, Generalitat de Catalunya, Greenpeace Spain, Harresiak apurtuz, ILGA, Interior Ministry, IOE, ITE, JUNTA DE Andalucía, Justicia i Pau, KALAPIE, Kontseilua, La Verde, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Environment, MON VERD, Movimento contra la intolerancia, NUNCA MÁIS, Oinarriak, Plataforma Rural, PNV, PTP, Secretaria de Estado de Cooperacion interterritorial, Secretaria de Estrado de Emigracion y Emigracion, SOS Racisme, T&E, UEMA, UGT, Universidad Autonoma, Universidad Pablo Olavide, University of Basque Country, University of Cordoba, XUNTA DE Galicia.

Sweden

Anti-Discrimination Bureau, Assyriska Föreningen, Caritas, Centrum mot Racism, Greenpeace, Ingen Människa är Illegal, Integrationsverket, Jordbruksdepartementet, Miljöpartiet, NUTEK, Ombudsman mot Ethnisk Diskriminering, Rätten för Ulfolk Samernas Arbetsgrupp, SameÄtnam, Samerådet, Sametinget/Partiet Skogssamerna, SNF, Swedish Secretariat on Acid Rain.

Belgium

AFSCA, Amnesty International, ARACH, BAL, BBeL, Belgian MEP (member of the Greens), CBAI, CECLR/CGKR, Centre de Mediation - aeroport de Bruxelles, CIRE/OCIV, CNAPD, CRIOC, Croix-Rouge – Belgique, EBLUL, EFSA, FOE, FOYER, Greenpeace, GSARA, Hand in Hand, IBGE/BIM, IEB/BRAL, IEW, Info-Turk, Initiatif, Jeunesse maghrébine, Les Amis de la Terre, Liga voor Mensenrechten, MRAX, Nature et Progrès, Net-Sky, UBNCA/BUTV, VAKA, Velt, Vlaams minderheden centrum, Wervel.

EU level

AER, Commission (DG REG), Commission (DG ENV), Commission (DG SANCO), Commission (DG Transport), COR, CPMR, EBLUL, EEB, EESC, Enar, EU Commission, Eurocities, EUROLANG, European Parliament (REGI Com), FOE, FUEN, Greenpeace, Initiative Transport Europe, MPG, REGLEG, Social Platform, T&E Federation.

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The project's goal was to provide an answer to the compelling question: To what extent do the activities of public-interest associations, activist coalitions, and movement-parties bridge the large gap between the European citizenry and European level policymaking?

The project studied the modalities and outcomes of participation of civil society organisations in three sectors: environmental, regional and anti-racist policy. In each sector two distinct policy issues were considered which corresponded to a different mix of civil society organisations. In the environmental sector the sub-sectors were the GMO-issue and transport related issues. It was useful to compare these two sectors as one – transport – was an older policy area which many observers perceive mainly in its technical and economic dimension while GMO is a newer area that is currently highly salient in European media.

In the regionalist sector the two sub-sectors were minority languages and structural policy. The topic of minority languages is often perceived in its cultural aspects while the issue of structural funds involves many economic actors. The two sub-sectors in the anti-racist sector were issues relating to labour market and cultural issues of support for anti-racist initiatives in the cultural sphere. Twelve universities in ten European member states participated. The countries included ensured broad geographical coverage -- the case selection was aimed at a framework which allowed comparisons across different types of states in terms of state centralisation, propensity for including non state actors in consultation fora, and North-South and East-West variance. The project was articulated in five Work Packages.

The first provided an overview of the policy history of our key sectors in the countries involved, their tradition of involvement and mobilisation of civil society organisations, and public opinion dynamics in the sectors studied. Following on from this landscape study of national policy histories, MAC activity and public opinion surveys related to the three policy sectors, the main research fieldwork for the project was spread out over the next three Work Packages. Work Package 2 analysed the governance-civil society relationship in the ten participating countries in detail on the basis of primary research. Work Package 3 focused on analysing the interaction between the national level of civil society activity and the EU level. Work Package 4 focused on the role of European Social Movement Organisations (EMOs), i.e. EU level associations and umbrella organisations with a permanent representation in Brussels, and their impact on decision-making at the EU level. Work Package 5 integrated the preceding Work Packages providing a multi-level

understanding of representation dynamics, civil society activity and political opportunities.

The different Work Packages were based on interviews with representatives of civil society, as well as with institutional actors, privileged witnesses and other key participants to the policy process. The information gathered from the interviews was completed with information from documents from social movement organisations and the European Union.

The theoretical focus of the CIVGOV project was on two issues: the dynamics and problems of representing citizens concerns and the political opportunities that associations experienced. The project examined the workings of chains of representation from individual citizens to civil society organisations, moving up a set of territorial levels from localities in the member states to the European level. This operationalised issues stressed in official EU documents in relation to civil society and the internal structure, dynamics and representativeness of MACs. Secondly the project examined the Political Opportunity Structure (POS) of associations in their relationship to decision-making processes. In this context an examination of the impact of policy ideas proposed by civil society organisations and the framing processes by which MACs seek to reflect societal opinion and affect the policy-making agenda was also undertaken.

Although it was largely rooted in the theoretical framework of social movement literature, this study did not focus on social movements in their emergent state when their impact on policy-making rests largely on their ability to threaten disruption and the consequent media impact, but rather on their more established and institutionalised forms. It is of note that the literature on social movements reflects a debate regarding the distinction between *social movements* and *public interest organisations and lobbies (sometimes referred to as pressure groups)*. Some authors believe that they should be differentiated, while others do not. We took a somewhat different position, arguing that as social movements become institutionalised, they come increasingly to reflect aspects of civil society, whilst retaining a distinctive character among protest-oriented organisations. Our starting assertion was that they represent European civil society through a complex of organisations whose role in policy-making is to provide alternative policy knowledge, coordinate voices in civil society, and act as sources of advocacy in the policy process - rather than to mainly mobilise protesters as is more typical of emerging social movements.

This broader perspective on the role of social movements puts the focus on the nature of political representation in contemporary European societies and broadens its forms

horizontally and vertically. Horizontally, social movements come to interact with a wide set of other organised non-state actors and provide alternative or supplementary channels of connection between political systems and citizens. Vertically, social movement organisations together with other civil society actors connect territorial levels also supplementing electoral vertical channels of representation.

The experience of nation states demonstrates that alternative *channels for preference aggregation* and upward transmission can exist. For several reasons (the character of the issues, the groups affected, and the like) an increasingly large collection of groups have organised to voice the demands of constituencies incapable of finding a place within established paths of preference aggregation. Social and political movements of different sorts and public interest groups often connected to movements (MACs) seek to serve an alternative representative role and can be successful in their endeavours. Certainly, environmental movement organisations have been among the more successful social movement groups throughout Europe. However, this is less the case for regionalist or anti-racist movements. Hence, in performing a comparative study of interest aggregation the goal was to provide an insight into the determinants of policy success and effective interest representation at the EU level. In fact, surprisingly little is known about their mode of operation, their specific effectiveness in different areas of the policy process, and most importantly their ability to carry forward to the European level the issues that most concern their constituencies.

The CIVGOV project assessed how norms and policy ideas move up from the local to the national and European levels of governance. This is an important issue in the literature on transnational networks, who are seen as actors able to push for a change in policy beliefs at all levels (Keck and Sikkink 1998).

A key assumption contained in this literature - that elites are morally and cognitively insensitive to the value of emerging norms and that they become sensitised only after a long time lag - is vulnerable to criticism, and quite plausible alternatives to these assumptions have been proposed. For example, Checkel (1999) proposes a 'policy-learning' alternative in which elites are seen as willing to learn the content and policy implications of emerging norms (Checkel 1999). This approach coincides with our view of institutional actors as importers and translators of social movement ideas into institutional languages, operating at the same time as social movement activists outside the institutional settings. In this light our interviewed activists at all territorial levels emphasised the importance of institutional allies for their action to be effective and more specifically stressed the relevance of personal contacts with committed decision-makers.

Building a coalition for the advocacy of environmental or antiracist concerns appeared to be a valuable and effective strategy.

However, this is also a problematic strategy. From a normative point of view, the centrality of personal contacts questions the need for transparency of policy processes. It is of note that the opaqueness of the political system (particularly at the national level in the majority of Member States and at the European level with reference to the Council) constitutes the more urgent problem to be addressed according to organisations involved at the national and the EU levels.

Consequently, in terms of policy recommendations, our results suggest that transparency should be prioritised: who is involved in decision-making, when and for what reason are basic information to be made public. It has been often reported that a general understanding of what is going on at the EU level is particularly difficult to grasp. The European Commission stressed that it is important for the quality of EU policy to 'ensure wide participation throughout the policy chain - from conception to implementation' (White Paper on Governance), recognising that the added value of civil society organisations derives from their capacity for bringing new ideas into policy-making. But they are also of central importance in formulation, implementation and monitoring stages. Our results suggest that civil society plays a role in the ideational stage of policy processes; that is civil society organisations are mainly asked to bring their expertise and policy ideas to enrich the viewpoint on specific issues. It is of note that their ability to bring new issues onto the political agenda, that is in formulating original policy proposals, is clearly limited. A similar trend can be observed in relation to subsequent stages of policy processes – implementation and monitoring - when civil society organisations are seldom present. In practical terms activists participate in consultation processes and public hearings but they are not able to follow the entire process of decision-taking, which remains remote. Consequently, our results show a degree of scepticism about the real willingness of national and European political actors to get civil society included.

Umbrella organisations have an advantage from this point of view. Our results clearly suggest that lobbying EU institutions is a full time job. Locally and nationally based organisations tend to recognise that, for lobbying to be effective, a very specific knowledge about EU political arenas and a continuous presence in Brussels are essential factors.

As noted, interactions between national organisations and European officials take place, but less frequently and on an ad hoc basis. There are different reasons for explaining this finding, relating to perceptions about the relevance of EU regulation for different policy

sectors, on resource constraints and on preferences of EU institutional actors. In the following three sections we present results related to these factors.

1. The relevance of EU regulation

Our results suggest that perceptions about the importance of Europe are not uniformly distributed; rather they vary across countries and across policy sectors.

European policies are perceived to be of central importance in the context of environmentalism and structural regionalism, while there are significant differences across countries in relation to the perceived relevance of EU regulations in the fields of anti-racism and of the protection of minority languages. In particular Italian, Spanish and Greek anti-racist activists note that initiatives at the EU level allowed them to put the issue on the domestic agenda. In such countries the fight against racism was completely marginal until the EU intervention in the sector. On the contrary, where a well-established national tradition in policies for fighting discrimination is present, such as in Sweden and in the UK, European directives are perceived to be of little use. For instance both social and institutional British actors agree on the idea that European anti-discrimination principles have been implemented for addressing problems and filling gaps that are present elsewhere in Europe. In principle, a similar divide could be observed in the field of environmentalism: northern countries have been traditionally more active in promoting environmental protection, while southern European countries and new accession countries showed a delay. However environmental policy dates back to the 1970s and at present all activists tend to recognise the importance of EU regulation in the sector.

A specification is needed in the case of language minorities; even if the institutions of the European Union are not of central importance for activists, a European dimension of mobilisation is highly valued. It is 'Europe' and not the 'European Union' that is deemed to be of relevance. This is also the case for the more specific mobilisation against expansion at airports: our results suggest that even if the EU institutions have no specific power for decisions over national plans for the development of infrastructures and the policy area is not Europeanised, there is an awareness of the importance of raising the issue at the EU level, because local communities who live near to airports face similar problems. Such results give some strength to the hypothesis formulated by Kohler-Koch that the formation of interest groups is an anticipation of future developments at the

supranational level¹, an anticipation aiming at gaining influence over the definition of a policy area and its basic directions (Kohler-Koch 1994).

2. Budgetary and time constraints

Perceptions on the relevance of EU play a great role in motivating civil society organisations to take part in policy processes. However our results suggest that even if the perception about the relevance of the European level is diffused, this does not constitute a sufficient reason for getting involved and does not necessarily lead to an effective involvement. The costs of transnational mobilisation are too high to be easily met.

Budgetary constraints also limit the repertoire of strategies to be employed. This is particularly relevant in the case of media campaigns that, if practicable, would be one of the preferred strategies to be adopted. Media campaigns are said to be very effective: in all three policy sectors, activists tend to share this view, although environmentalists are more convinced and anti-racists more sceptical as to the level of public support they could achieve. At the same time, the costs of engaging in such activity are prohibitive, especially at the national and at the European levels, and consequently there are very few extensive campaigns autonomously promoted by civil society organisations. It is of note, however, that not all organisations find it interesting or useful to address the general public: as noted, associations involved in providing services at the local level are more likely to focus on their particular constituency and to make contact with local institutional actors.

Interestingly, and in contrast to the standard assumption that 'politicisation' at the EU level would not work, EU officials tend to consider media campaigns a powerful strategy. More generally the effectiveness of mobilising the general public through the mass media has been stressed by institutional actors at all territorial levels.

The lack of resources also affects opportunities for recruitment and for training staff. It has often been noted by our interviewees that civil society organisations are understaffed and consequently unable to act properly. The need for increasing human resources emerges in all sectors. In addition, engaging in effective lobbying activities requires specific skills and knowledge that can be acquired by proper training and direct experiences of participation. In this light stability of funds is essential and it has often been seen as problematic and highly dependent on changing political priorities.

¹ Such hypothesis is usually contrasted with the opposite one, stating that the formation of public and private interest groups is a reaction to the Europeanization of a policy sector.

3. Mutual expectations of institutional and civil society actors

One important area of analysis is relations between various kinds of non-state and state actors at different territorial levels. Our findings show that there is in general an uneasy relationship between business lobbies and public interests. Our results suggest that activists across sectors share the perception that the political system is strongly biased, and systematically tends to favour private interest groups. Many state actors also share this view. This opinion is particularly strong among environmentalists, who tend to identify an opponent in business pressure groups. Organised business interests are less relevant in the anti-racist sectors. In the regional sector the distinction is weaker as overall the sector is more institutionalised.

A second connected issue relates to the preferred level of interest aggregation. A multiplicity of small and large organisations populates all the sectors in member states and at EU level. At local level both branches of large organisations and small organisations are consulted. As one proceeds through territorial levels of governance larger organisations play a more significant role. There is evidence that EU institutional actors tend to prefer umbrella organisations as interlocutors. In general terms, our interviews suggest that there is a preference among decision-makers to deal with a restricted number of well-established social actors. At all territorial levels, the organisational capacity for aggregating preferences is positively evaluated by politicians and civil servants. In this light, there are differences among the three policy sectors: organisations representing regional minorities refer to a clearly identifiable territorial constituency, and our results suggest that this constitutes an advantage in terms of political relevance. Conversely, anti-racist organisations, especially at the local level, are often small and unstable; particularly in countries where immigration is a relatively recent phenomenon – such as Italy, Spain and Greece – where this unstructured nature of the civil society sector constitutes a severe constraint to opportunities for accessing the political system. However, the request for aggregating public interests in larger and more representative organisations that often comes from state actors is not easily accepted by civil society organisations, which are often proud of their ideological, territorial or sectoral specificity.

Access to dialogue between associational and institutional actors also varies on the basis of the mutual expectations which guide their interaction. The most frequent role that institutional actors emphasised in their expectations from civil society is as a support in guaranteeing the high quality of policies.

Organised civil society can replace or increment the often insufficient legitimacy of political actors which was traditionally rooted in principles of representative government with 'output legitimacy'(Scharpf 1999). They can contribute to the formation of better policies which will meet with approval from concerned sectors of the population. This in turn means utilising civil society to address policy-makers' information deficit, their need to aggregate interests, to formulate efficient and accepted policies, to monitor outcomes, help with implementation, their need to approach policy crises in a concerted manner, to enrich decision making with new policy ideas and to spur collective processes of policy learning. All these needs can benefit from a direct input of civil society, as is acknowledged by several policy makers. These aims justify the inclusion of a broad range of civil society organisations, which range from business organisations, to churches, NGOs, public interest groups and the many activities they perform – sometimes the same organisations taking on different roles such as research institutes, advocacy organisations and fundraising. Generally, the role of all public interest organisations is perceived as a necessary counterbalance to the stronger resources and level of access of private interest groups.

Secondly, connected to this approach is the realisation that a deeper involvement of civil society is simply necessary because in some respects states are no longer the main locus of political authority. Control over a growing range of issues increasingly illudes the state and is associated with the full variety of civil society organisations (Dryzek 2000: 5). It is for this reason that the involvement of public interest groups is essential in monitoring functions that the state cannot afford, in ensuring compliance through non-state sanctions, and in fostering the transposition of legislation through sectoral pressure on policy makers in member states.

Thirdly, a different function of civil society relates to the fact that increasingly 'democracy' comes to be conceptualised in terms of deliberation. As Dryzek argues, the essence of democracy is now widely held to be deliberation rather than interest aggregation, constitutional rights or self governance (Dryzek 2000). In this sense a project of democratisation of the EU together with a continuation of European construction and a connected project of increasing its legitimacy takes the form of integration through deliberation. This means seeking to create an additional arena for airing the views of the national demos. This approach is particularly relevant at EU level as civil society there, as a differentiated sphere of the demos, can provide an intermediating civic sphere to connect European societies to transnational governance (Armstrong 2001).

Fourthly, another approach involves attempts to build a demos through the shaping of the public sphere or other influences of OCS, such as the supposedly beneficial impact of associationism on the formation of social capital and the democratic attitudes of the population. Thus policy makers can attempt to utilise civil society to effect desired attitudinal change, for instance more tolerant attitudes towards discriminated minorities or more concern for the environment. As in previous categories, generally civil society organisations relate positively to these expectations, and contribute to diffuse information on existing policy and more specifically on European opportunities. This is for instance the case of anti-racists organisations who tried to get citizens informed on the content of EU directives on anti-discrimination. However it is also of note that this socialising function is not unanimously taken on board, and a high number of locally and nationally-based associations tend to refer to their specific memberships and constituencies. Among associations positively involved in socialising citizens to specific policy beliefs or to the advantage of EU integration, their grievances concern the insufficient centrality and access they receive, the limited impact on decision making and the often ritualistic nature that characterises some of the fora in which they are involved.

4. Political Opportunity Structure

Political Opportunity Structure (POS) was one of the main dimensions covered throughout the study. It refers to the features and changes in the political system and power structure of a country/system of governance that facilitate the emergence and contribute to the success of SMO/MAC activity. The reports focused on the following themes: nature and structure of MACs in the policy sector (type of organisations, relationship to each other, style of leadership, accountability to members/supporters etc); issues and campaigns focused on by MACs in the policy sectors; assessment of public identification with MACs in the policy sector; strategies employed by the MACs in the policy sector; perceptions as regards the openness/responsiveness of the political opportunity structure for MACs in the policy sector; assessment of the degree of common understanding among MACs and between MACs and institutional and other relevant actors in the policy sector; perceptions of the EU level of decision-making and involvement in EU level activism; and assessment of the general degree of success of MACs in the policy sector. Our conceptualisation of POS is different to the ones used in the social movement literature which define movements and institutions as opponents. With the concept of MAC we see as our unit of analysis a relatively integrated and stable alliance of certain institutionalised movements and certain institutional domains which relate in a conflictual manner to other institutional domains.

This redefined POS theory became central in all Work Packages. It was initially used to assess the relevant national literature and to analyse the different MAC domains in the countries studied (Work Packages 1 and 2). It was utilised in Work Package 3 which focused on EU-national intermediaries as regards civil society organisations and their institutional counterparts, and in Work Package 4 which focused on the direct interaction between MACs and the European Institutions. This approach usefully pointed to fine grained differences among the sectors and the Member States studied. Some examples will suffice to illustrate the POS findings.

In relation to the environmental sector, in reviewing the ten countries studied, we find in general – and this is very different in the case of the transport and the GMO sectors – a very mixed political opportunity structure (POS). With reference to GMOs, if we divide it into three levels, local, regional and central, the POS is highly influential in the latter two levels, while it is less important in the local setting. This is not to say that the anti-GMO grassroots movements have not achieved the support of thousands of local corporations and mayors in their campaigns for transgenic-free zones, but that the actions and campaigns, the political decisions and the political allies that have made a real contribution, have been developed at the regional and central territorial levels. This points to the relevance of the intensity of connections between the movement compact and national and regional institutional domains. Conversely, with respect to the political opportunity structure in the transport sector, the varied panorama offered by the numerous campaigns and alliances promoted by European environmentalism tends, in general, to find a more favourable terrain and to widen its base of action at the local and regional levels. However, in certain countries (Sweden and Great Britain, for example) the central government structures acquire a greater dimension and exercise a greater attraction for the social movements and their campaigns, rather than local and regional government structures. In general, the local levels are the appropriate places for finding both social and political allies - even in the institutional and administrative framework – for confronting the transport plans, normally designed or funded by the state authorities and supported economically from Brussels.

Just as the political opportunity structure (POS) is different in each state, the perception and evaluation of the role played by the European Union varies in the different countries where activists were consulted. There are also barriers of access that make perceived POS difficult to utilise. Environmentalists are aware that their advocacy should be exerted both towards national and European institutions; but because the EU institutions are situated far away, they have to acquire special skills to achieve results in Brussels. They realise that in some cases their own national governments are fundamental in decision-making, so they also have to work at Member States level.

With reference to the structural regional sector our findings indicate that the regional level is generally reported as the most open one, with a few exceptions. Also the local level generally gets positive appreciation, but is less widely mentioned than the regional level. The national level only gets genuine positive appreciations in Germany (a 'success story') but outspoken negative evaluations in France, Greece and Spain (and to some extent Sweden). Europe is mentioned rarely by regional SMOs. If it is mentioned, references are nearly always positive. In about half of the cases the EU is perceived to be more open than the national government, while the regional level is perceived to be somewhat more responsive. However, there exists a general discontent about the problems of access to the EU for most of the regional SMOs, which perceive themselves as too small, poor, understaffed, uninformed and inexperienced to interact effectively with the European Commission.

With reference to the EU the situation is radically different in the sector of minority languages. There is there a wide consensus that the EU is a significant positive new element in the political opportunity structure of minority language SMOs. For many minority nationalist movements and parties, the link with European integration has allowed them to frame their demands in wider terms, that is, to give their demand a positive reference (against old-fashioned state-wide nationalism) as 'exemplary Europeans that appreciate the values of differences and tolerance in a multicultural Europe', and get rid of the all too common negative images of folklore, backwardness, traditionalism and even right-wing bias. This helped to overcome generational conflicts between the old 'nationalist' defenders of the minority language and younger generations seeking new legitimation of the defence of minority language protection in post-nationalist and post-statist multicultural Europeanism. For many SMOs, European integration offers additional meeting points, arenas, opportunities for coordination, networking and mutual learning. Europe has expanded their capacity of venue shopping, shifting mobilisation and lobbying between the local, regional, national and European level.

Within the anti-racist sector, there were differing perceptions as regards the level of openness and responsiveness of the political opportunity structure across the countries studied and also in relation to the differing levels of governance (EU, national, regional, local) discussed. The EU level was generally seen as offering new and in many cases, better opportunities to anti-racist movements. The picture at the national level was more varied. In general, a distinction can be made between countries with longer standing histories of immigration and anti-racist movements, such as the UK, France, Germany, Sweden and Belgium – where the political system at the national level was seen as fairly open – and countries of newer immigration, such as Spain, Italy and Poland, where the

system was viewed as fairly closed and unresponsive. More optimism was expressed in this respect in Greece and Hungary, where the system was viewed as in a process of opening up towards the positions of anti-racist movements. In Italy, on the other hand, the political system was viewed as having closed up considerably following the change from a centre-left to a centre-right government in 2001 – with the previous relatively open dialogue being discontinued since this date. In Spain too, dialogue at the national level between movements and institutions was seen as fairly non-existent. In Greece, the fact that many leaders' of movements were also political actors meant that they often had greater informal access to decision-making, although in some cases it was noted that politicians themselves express racist opinions.

5. Conclusions

Overall the CIVGOV project has documented and explained the variations in functions, scope and political relevance of a broad sample of civil society organisations throughout Europe. It has identified the important role that associations play in the democratic life of all European Member States, it has also stressed the contradictions that civil society organisations and their political referents need to address. For instance contradictions between expecting a representative civil society, an innovative and effective contribution of associations to the policy process and an accountable civil society. But civil society organisations constitute a diverse field. Some are better at producing innovation in policy ideas even when not representative. Some are representative but their elaborate mechanisms of consultation of their base makes them slow in responding to policy crises. Overall they perform a wide set of functions which are often essential to democratic life.

The first and central role that all political actors at all levels of government tend to emphasise in their relations with associations is support for decision making activities. Over all other concerns, political actors stress that the most valuable input that civil society organisations can provide is improvements to the policy process – or in other words output legitimacy (Scharpf 1999). They generally welcome the role of NGOs in all the policy sectors we studied, and assess their performance with reference to a set of criteria which often relate to their contribution to improve the policy process. The ability to work in symphony with institutions and therefore form effective MACs is particularly valuable but difficult to achieve as ideological, territorial and sectoral fragmentation criss-cross both the associational and institutional fields making stable collaboration problematic. Nonetheless, organised civil society can have a relevant input on a number of policy functions – first of all in their role as information gatherers. Organised civil society's information-gathering abilities, together in some instances with its role in

monitoring transposition and feed-back on policy implementation is important -- its monitoring role being particularly stressed at EU level.

In enlisting civil society to improve performance, institutional actors declare their readiness to increase inclusion and support, but express a concern with current associational performance when assessed through the institutionally sanctioned criteria of participation, openness, accountability, effectiveness and coherence. This raises important issues of cooptation and institutionalisation for the civil society sector. While some movement groups are ready to trade access and funds for cooperation with institutional objectives, others are more reluctant.

A second role attributed to organised civil society that also emerged at different levels of governance concerns the need of Member States to let different kinds of non state actors mediate and resolve some of their conflicts outside the political arena. This role is particularly relevant at EU level where initiatives such as the Open Method of Co-ordination encourage 'soft' negotiated solutions to policy conflicts, and other structures which involve civil society as a counterbalance to organised interests.

Much of the EU structure has been created to respond to the fact that policy needs to be conducted beyond the state. This is clear in all the policy areas examined. In the environmental field, for instance, the Europeanisation of environmental policy resulted from concerns with issues such as trans-border pollution, prevention of competitive lowering of environmental standards, and the necessity to spread and coordinate cross-nationally environmental policy across territorial levels and policy sectors, such as agricultural, energy or tourism policy (Ruzza 2000). If EU policy is already policy beyond the state, it is also increasingly becoming policy conducted through agreements among non state actors. In hollowed out states, public authorities often lack the means and the will to regulate society and prefer to leave difficult tasks of interest intermediation to composite policy networks, and with them to the organised civil society sector.

A different category of functions attributed to civil society recur in the thinking of some associational and some political actors, for instance the European Commission, which to an extent advocates an interventionist role on the part of public authorities in fostering and developing new forms of civil society aggregation.² This is for instance the case of the encouragement historically given to the formation of new networks in areas such as anti-discrimination policy. For instance, in Italy in the context of the approval of a migration law by the centre-left coalition of 1996-2001, a consultative role was given to a

² See Commission (2000). *Developing New Modes Of Governance*. Brussels, Forward Studies Unit, Notis Lebessis, John Paterson, Working Paper, 2000.

new organisation – a previously inexistent migrant umbrella network – to formally represent migrants at the national level. On the other hand, and particularly in recent years, when state interventionist approaches are seen as unjustified interventionism, many institutional actors dissent from this approach. For instance the participatory fora of the previous example was stopped after change of ruling coalitions.

A connected but distinct aspect in the creation of new associational representation channels concerns the role of organised civil society in the public sphere and therefore a process of modification of public opinion in the direction of attitudes valued by both civil society and political actors – for instance attitudes towards institutionalised political values such as environmental sustainability or anti-racism. Civil society can also more broadly be valued for goals that go beyond specific policy sectors. For instance, at EU level, both the Commission and associations emphasise their contribution to European integration through their contribution to the creation of a European public sphere (Commission 2000), thus linking satisfaction with the EU policy performance with moves to promote the construction of a European demos.

To sum up, civil society is utilised by a range of actors to pursue different types of goals. The CIVGOV project found that these can then be clustered in a few types – each of these types has implications for the representation of citizens within the different levels of governance of the European political system. Each of these types also has implications for the possibility of civil society organisations to identify and exploit emerging political opportunities.

First, in their ability to address concerns with output legitimacy, associations are becoming essential participants in the policy process. In an age of hollowed out states resources to gather reliable information are often missing. To the extent that civil society organisations can provide it their POS improves.

Secondly, civil society can perform a policy steering function even outside of the state. Social movement organisations can for instance signal the boundaries of policy acceptability of industry choices in the environmental field, and negotiate with the business sector through threats of political protest even outside state-centred dialogues. In this respect, their ability to retain a connection to mobilisation and disruption remains an important political opportunity.

Thirdly, associations can be recruited to spread socially approved values. In this respect civil society organisations with a strong access to the media such as Greenpeace and therefore an ability to contribute to policies that require citizens collaboration (for instance environmental or anti-racist policies) enjoy a political or a cultural opportunity

which for instance has emerged in EU level interviews. Fourthly, more broadly, to the extent that associations are popular among EU publics (and many associations such as environmental groups are generally popular), such associations can help in transferring legitimacy to political actors who involve them. This legitimacy granting aspect constitutes an important political opportunity for the associational sector.

6. Policy Recommendations

The results of our research indicate that civil society organisations (at both the national and supranational levels) wish to have a generally greater role in decision-making, and that their being still too far outside these processes at the EU level contributes greatly to the scepticism with which many of them regard the EU and its mission. However, increasing their decision-making role is only acceptable to the extent that they can show democratic credentials. In the language of EU policy documents, they need to prove their accountability, internal democracy, broad pan-European base and good mechanisms of internal consultation.

Perhaps the most crucial need expressed by the civil society organisations that we interviewed was financial resources – preferably resources that would not be threatened by effective organising and advocacy. One way the shortage of resources expresses itself is in too few staff with training and/or experience that is insufficient to the challenges they face. The key concept here is capacity building – building a cadre of staff and first and second tier leadership with training in a variety of organisational and campaign oriented skills. These would include such areas as recruiting strategies, how to work effectively with the news media, political strategies, effectively combating the arguments of extreme groups such as ethno-nationalist parties, ways of getting people engaged, and developing national and international networks to support and learn from one another. Where national or locally based organisations have been especially effective and/or successful, that success could and should be drawn on in providing such training.

Resources should be aimed at addressing different needs. Resources are needed to employ already trained personnel such as lawyers and accountants that can spread knowledge and good practice in civil society organisations. Resources are needed to improve organisations' ability to interact with the media. Resources are needed to improve organisational ability to liaise across territorial levels.

An important decision concerns whether resources should mainly be directed to EU level networks or distributed more broadly. Our research shows that concentrating on EU level umbrella groups is only efficient after an authentic process of aggregation of views and preferences has begun to emerge in the field. In the early stages, in several policy areas

it is useful to distribute resources more widely and emphasise co-founding arrangements that motivate organisations to acquire a real and functioning base in member states' civil societies.

Inevitable tensions arise between groups at national and umbrella groups at the EU level. These might be managed by focusing on capacity building activities that *emphasise developing and strengthening multiple linkages* –between national organisations in different countries, between national and EU level organisations, and also between national organisations and EU institutions. The relocation of civil society organisations needs to be aided by EU information campaigns and other initiatives specifically directed at civil society organisations. We observed a misunderstanding of EU policies by civil society generally and a misperception of the EU's role in relevant policy sectors. This could usefully be addressed by the Commission in the context of collaboratively organised conferences and training seminars.

There are already many systems of reporting, evaluating and accounting in place in connection to the implementation of EU directives both in the formal sense (of adopting national legislation) and the practical sense (of actually implementing measures that produce the desired effects). These are however, not nearly as visible as they might be. Organised civil society could have a much more active role in such accounting – both in reporting in their own evaluations of the performance of their home country, and also in publicising that performance in the national news media (both in an absolute sense, and in comparison with other member states).

The implementation of the anti-racist directive provides an excellent example of how the EU can improve the involvement of civil society organisations in monitoring legislation and policy developments at the national level. Member states which previously had no such mechanisms were obliged to set up anti-discrimination agencies and involve civil society in monitoring policy. The involvement of civil society in monitoring policy implementation at the national level is a principle that could be extended across all EU policies involving national level implementation, although certain criteria would need to be met by civil society organisations and other relevant interest groups and stakeholders as to their level of representativeness, knowledge and relevance to the policy sector.

7. Dissemination Strategy

Dissemination of the project is continuing through a number of channels, particularly publications, conferences and new research projects. A number of the members of the project research network have produced or are producing conference papers and publications based on the project findings (see annex). Moreover, a number of the

members of the network are involved in new EU research projects in which they seek to develop the findings further. Notably, the scientific director of the project (Carlo Ruzza) is involved in the CINEFOGO Network of Excellence, which began in September 2005. The NoE CINEFOGO is intended to promote and disseminate scientific research on three main topics: Social Capital, the Voluntary Sector and Governance. Carlo Ruzza is the general coordinator for the third area, and in this light the NoE constitutes an important opportunity for disseminating the results of the CIVGOV project widely and for discussing them with a larger audience. It is intended to do this by staging a number of workshops under the CINEFOGO auspices, in which the CIVGOV results can be discussed with other academics, whilst preparations are being prepared.

Contacts with various associations and organisations active in the field of environmental policy, anti-racism and regionalism at the local, regional and national level have been made in all the countries participating in the project in the course of the fieldwork for the CIVGOV project, given that this involves interviews with activists and other interested actors in each of these three policy fields. Similarly, the fieldwork also involved contacts with institutional actors at the local, regional and national level. In November 2005, the CIVGOV Brussels workshop was staged, involving all CIVGOV partners. The results were presented to invited policy-makers, representatives of the Commission and civil society representatives (e.g. from the EEB, the Migration Policy Group, EBLUL, the Sami Parliament). The workshop provided an excellent opportunity for an exchange of views on the results and further contact with potential users.

A first major exercise in disseminating the results of the CIVGOV project took place at the conference of the European Consortium of Political Research (ECPR) in Budapest from 8-10 September 2005, at which nearly all partners participated in a conference section on 'Governance and Civil Society in Europe'. This involved panels on the specific sectors as well as a cross-sectoral comparative panel, a general theoretical panel, panels on the EU and transnational level of civil society and panels on the local level and on gender aspects. These panels have acted as an initial staging post in shaping the main collaborative publications to come out of the project.

Agreement has been reached with a publisher (Manchester University Press) to publish a book series on Civil Society and Governance (edited by Carlo Ruzza) in which various books disseminating the CIVGOV findings which be published. These include the following

- 1) An edited book comparing civil society-governance relations across the different national contexts represented in the project. This will have country chapters produced by each of the country teams.

- 2) An edited book with thematic chapters, focussing on the different policy sectors and on themes such as Europeanisation and the EU level of governance.
- 3) An edited book comparing anti-racist movements across the different national contexts represented in the project. This will have country chapters produced by each of the country teams.
- 4) An edited book comparing civil society advocacy in structural policy across the different national/regional contexts represented in the project. This will have country chapters produced by each of the country teams.
- 5) An edited book comparing minority language/cultural minority movements across the different national/regional contexts represented in the project. This will have country chapters produced by each of the country teams.
- 6) An edited book comparing environmental movements across the different national contexts represented in the project. This will have country chapters produced by each of the country teams.

II. BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES OF THE PROJECT

The CIVGOV project sought to examine the role of civil society organisations, broadly defined as Movement Advocacy Coalitions (MACs) - comprised of social movements and issue activists and advocates - in articulating the demands of European citizens into the decision-making processes of regional, national and EU level government. Research for the project comprised a number of Work Packages analysing the relationship between civil society and public policy-making at the regional, national and European level, and exploring the interface between these different levels of governance. The principle focus of fieldwork for the research was interviews with movement activists, civil society sympathisers, informed observers and institutional actors at the regional, national and European level. This was supplemented through analysis of documents and survey data. The project focused on civil society organisations connected to social movements. Referring to them as 'movement advocacy coalitions' (MACs henceforth) - loosely coordinated networks of social movement organisations - we conceive them as collective agents representing citizens. Their impact was considered in relation to three policy sectors - *environmentalism*, *regionalism*, and *anti-racism*. Within these broad policy areas, two sub-issues for each were focused upon: for *environmentalism*, resistance to the use of genetically modified organisms (GMOs) and the regulation of transport; for *regionalism*, the preservation and promotion of minority languages and cultures and the defence of socio-economic cohesion; for *anti-racism*, the promotion of anti-racist values and the adoption of labour market anti-discriminatory measures. The project aimed at a fuller understanding of the degree to which MACs in these policy sectors both reflect public preferences and influence policy-making agendas.

Presented here are the overall findings of the project, bringing together the results of four Work Packages. In the first year of the project, work focused on the national level of research, focusing on the relationship between public preferences, civil society organisations and policy agendas in each of the countries represented in the project. This involved an initial landscape study of the issue cultures relating to each of the 3 policy sectors (outlining policy histories and exploring public preferences and the extent of civil society for each) for Work Package 1 and a more detailed examination of the nature of MACs and their role in influencing policy-making agendas at the national level (based primarily on interviews with activists and other relevant actors) for Work Package 2. Later packages beginning in the second year of the project would focus on the interaction between the national and EU level of civil society and governance (Work Package 3) involving interviewees with 'mediators' between the national/sub-national level of activity, and then the role of European level MACs in EU policy-making communities

(Work Package 4) involving interviews with EU level activists and institutional activists usually based in Brussels.

III. SCIENTIFIC DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT RESULTS AND METHODOLOGY

Following on from the landscape study of national policy histories, MAC activity and public opinion surveys related to the three policy sectors, as provided in the first Work Package, research fieldwork for the project was spread out over three Work Packages. Work Package 2 analysed the governance-civil society relationship in the ten participating countries in detail on the basis of primary research - interviews with movement activists, civil society sympathisers, informed observers and institutional actors at the national and sub-national level. This was supplemented through analysis of documents and survey data. Work Package 3 focused on analysing the interaction between the national level of civil society activity and the EU level. It was based primarily on interviews with actors that play a mediating role between the national and EU level in the three policy sectors, i.e. national activists who deal specifically with the EU or EU level activists who have a liaison role in relation to activists in a particular country, and institutional actors who link the national and EU levels in the European Parliament, Council of Ministers/COREPER, Commission, Committee of the Regions and other institutions and agencies of the EU. Work Package 4 focused on the role of European Social Movement Organisations (EMOs), i.e. EU level associations and umbrella organisations with a permanent representation in Brussels, and their impact on decision-making at the EU level, involving interviews with EMO representatives in the three policy sectors and relevant actors in the EU institutions.

The research examined the role of organised civil society (OCS) from two main perspectives. 1) A focus on representation; 2) A focus on political opportunities and in this context an examination of the impact of policy ideas proposed by OCS organisations. The first perspective operationalises issues stressed in official EU documents in relation to civil society and the internal structure, dynamics and representativeness of MACs. These relate to openness, participation, accountability, effectiveness and coherence (see European Commission White Paper on European Governance, COM 2001/428). Thus the extent to which SMOs/MACs represent civil society and reflect public opinion, and to which they themselves are democratic and transparent bodies would be examined. The second perspective reflects interpretations of political opportunities structures (POS), as identified as relevant in the social movements literature. These include the relative openness or closure of the institutionalised political system; the stability or instability of that broad set of elite alignments that typically undergird a policy and the presence or absence of elite allies.

Therefore the main dimensions covered were the following:

1. a) Internal structure and dynamics of organisation – in discerning the effect to which SMO/MACs are representative of civil society, and their relationship both to government and to society as a whole, it is necessary to inquire into the decision-making structure of organisations. Are they democratic or elitist? Where do they get their funding from? Do they perform an educational role in society? Do they provide services or undertake campaigns on behalf of the government?

b) Constituencies and Representativeness of MACs – related to the above, it is important to discern how representative of society and public opinion as a whole SMOs/MACs are – do they represent a valid representative link between the public and the system of policy-making? How do they go about mobilising public opinion? To what extent do they deliberately seek to create a broader public identification with their positions in order both to improve their chances of affecting government policy and bolstering their own popular power base? To what extent are SMOs/MACs enmeshed in wider societal networks and reflect a wider civil society?

2. a) Political Opportunity Structure (POS) – what features of and changes in the political system and power structure of a country/system of governance facilitate the emergence and contribute to the success of SMO/MAC activity? How do the opportunities for SMOs/MACs to influence policy-making differ from the national to the European level? To what extent and how do they work with other like-minded organisations and within wider societal networks in order to improved their political opportunities? Political opportunities also emerge when a MACs’ discourse resonates with dominant policy discourses within society or aspects of its political system. Therefore the emerging ideational framings supported by MACs are also studied.

b) Framing Processes – Following from the above, there is an examination of the framing processes by which MACs seek to reflect societal opinion and affect the policy-making agenda. What is the degree of common understanding among and between SMOs/MACs, institutional and other actors regarding the problems facing the policy area? Do they have common criticisms? Are there vast differences between activists and policy-makers? How does this affect the success of SMOs/MACs? What strategies do they employ to make themselves heard?

1. Work Package 2

For Work Package 2 (as for the latter Work Packages), common interview guidelines to be followed by each of the partners were regarded as essential for the organisation of the work. In total, country teams were asked to undertake a total of 25 interviews per sector (75 per country overall). The project outline, technical annex to the contract and Work Package guidelines specified that each partner/country undertook 45 activist interviews (15 activists per sector). This entailed identifying 3 prominent SMO activists per each of the 3 sectors in the 5 different localities (or 5 in 3 regions). A sensible balance needed to be sought in order to ensure that the total number of interviews covered both sectoral sub-issues in roughly equal proportions. This meant that in some cases, it was necessary to concentrate on one of the sub-issues in one locality, and the other sub-issue in another locality, while in some localities it was possible to cover both sub-issues at the same time.

In addition to these activist interviews, scope was provided for an additional 10 interviews per sector (30 in all per country) with other relevant actors. These did not necessarily have to be from the localities studied, and could be concentrated in capital cities or be national level activists or other interested actors. These additional interviews could be used to interview relevant institutional actors in the policy sectors, academic/journalist experts involved in analysis or advocacy within the policy sector and other 'privileged witnesses' (this could even include opponents, e.g. business representatives opposing regulation in environmentalism or populist politicians opposing anti-racist measures or 'nationalists/centralists' opposing regional policies). These additional interviews were also used to fill in gaps facilitating interviews with prominent advocates/activists/experts not covered by the interviews with activists in the 5 localities/3 regions, or where there was an imbalance in interviews between the two sub-sectors in each policy area. They could also be used where it was deemed of utility to interview relevant institutional actors to get their view on the civil society-governance relationship in the specific sectors. It was not decided that all partners cover their capital cities as one of their 5 localities, so the interviews could also be used in relation to prominent national actors based in the capital cities (or regional capitals).

For the regionalist sector in particular there was a variation in the type of actor interviewed. Nevertheless, the term Movement Advocacy Coalition (MAC) was deliberately framed as a broad one. While for the other policy actors the relevant MAC actors were mostly SMO activists, in the regionalist sector (particular the structural fund sub-sector) the main MAC actors came not from SMOs, but were other intermediate actors – e.g. members of regional agencies, regional politicians etc who act as advocates

for more regional funds, better/more efficient regional policies etc. For the cultural/linguistic regionalism sector, spokespersons from the key movement parties would be a focus of study. Also in the other sectors, the MAC term would be defined broadly. Thus for example in the anti-racist sector, some key MAC actors come from state-funded bodies, such as the Commission for Racial Equality and Race Equality Councils in the UK.

The questionnaires were adapted for each sub-sector and included modified questions for privileged witnesses and institutional actors, the line of questioning followed a standard format which sought to elicit answers regarding the following points:

- 1) Campaigns: Which recent campaigns SMOs/MACs had recently been involved in (and overlap between policy areas).
- 2) Strategies: Which strategies SMOs/MACs employ to influence policy-makers at the sub-regional/regional/national/European level. Which strategies are considered the most effective. Whether or not there any more effective strategies that SMOs/MACs are not capable of or willing to employ, and reasons for this.
- 3) European networks: The degree of contact between activists in different European countries or involvement in networks of activists at the transnational/European level. The utility of such contacts and networks to activists.
- 4) Cognitive Impact on supporters. The degree to which SMOs/MACs keep members, supporters and target audience informed regarding their activities at the national/European level. The extent to which supporters are aware of these activities at the national/European level? The channels used to diffuse information (meetings, friendly press, newsletter, website & forum, email, etc)
- 5) Policy-making structures and accountability. The extent to which organisations ensure that the interests and views of their membership, supporters and target audience are taken on board. The extent to which members and supporters are involved in the decision-making, strategy forming and policy-making of the organisation, and the extent to which such involvement is formalised or formally guaranteed.
- 6) Service delivery. The extent to which SMOs are involved in the following on behalf of government bodies: delivering services, delivery of information, participating in campaigns.

- 7) Consultation: The extent of SMO/MAC involvement in official national/regional government consultation/co-decision exercises. Reasons for involvement/non-involvement. Impression of value of such consultation. Perception of objectives of government in instigating this and SMOs/MACs in participating. Extent of other forms of contact between SMOs/MACs and institutional actors/decision-makers.
- 8) Responsiveness: Extent to which SMO/MAC positions have been taken on board by policy-makers. Responsiveness of policy-makers to SMO/MAC positions. Examples in which positions have been taken on board/ignored.
- 9) Openness: General level of openness of political system towards the activism of SMOs/MACs. Extent of evolution over time. Factors that lead governments to respond to the activities of SMOs/MACs.
- 10) European opportunities: Opinion of the EU policy-making arena in the policy sector under question. Quality of opportunities offered to influence and shape policy in comparison with the national and regional level.
- 11) Mutual learning: Lessons that policy-makers in the countries and regions being studied can learn from experiences in other countries.
- 12) Common understandings. Extent to which perceptions of the policy field (criticisms, challenges, problems etc relating to the policy area) are shared between and among the various actors, i.e. activists, public opinion, and policy-makers. Main points of difference between actors. Extent of bias among policy-making elites.
- 13) Conflict: Degree of conflict and disagreement among SMOs and other civil society actors (including parties) in the policy field. Basis of conflict (e.g. objectives, values, strategies, means, etc).
- 14) Alliances. Extent to which alliances between SMOs and other civil society organisations have been formed. Context of such alliances. Importance of alliances for SMOs/MACs. Purpose of such alliances (e.g. legitimisation, better access to decision-makers, pooling resources, better information etc).
- 15) Network Centrality: Perceptions of the most influential actors within policy sector and degree of interaction with and between them.

- 16) Mobilising Public Opinion: Supporters and target audience of SMOs/MACs and strategies for mobilising public opinion.
- 17) Public Identification. Estimation of public support for SMO/MAC positions. Sectors of public from which most/least support received.
- 18) Financial Resources. Sources of Funding of SMO/MACs. Appropriateness of receiving funding from government organisations and private companies.
- 19) Forward outlook Perceptions of challenges facing SMO/MACs and their policy causes in the future. Degree of optimism in facing challenges.

The table below provides a country breakdown of the number of interviews undertaken sector-by-sector in the course of the fieldwork of Work Package 2, and the localities/regions in which the interviews were undertaken.

Table 1. Interviews for Work Package 2

	Environmentalism	Regionalism	Anti-Racism	Total	Localities Covered
Italy	25	26	25	76	Rome (national), Sardinia (Cagliari), Friuli-Venezia-Giulia (Udine), Milan, Naples, Bologna, Turin
Spain	25	25	25	75	Madrid, Bilbao – Basque Country, Barcelona, Santiago de Compostela, Seville – Andalucia
Greece	21	29	19	69	Athens, Thessaloniki, Patras, Lesvos, Thrace
France	25	20	25	70	Paris, Lyon, Marseille, Toulouse, Rennes, Strasbourg, Quimper, Ajaccio, Bordeaux
Belgium	20	20	20	60	Brussels capital region, Flemish periphery around Brussels, Antwerp, Namur, Eupen, Oostend, Liège, Sambreville, Verviers

UK	32	22	16	70	London, Cambridge, Colchester-Stansted, Nottingham, Plymouth, Norwich, Cornwall, Cardiff-Wales, Scotland (Edinburgh, Glasgow, Inverness)
Germany	23	25	18	66	Berlin, Potsdam, Frankfurt, Munich, Flensburg, Cottbus
Hungary	24	17	33	74	Budapest, Tomor, Szolnok, Pecs, Gyor, Szeged, Miskolc, Nyiregyhaza
Poland	25	25	25	75	Warsaw, Katowice, Krakow, Bielsko-Biala, Opole, Gliwice, Mikolow, Dabrowa Gornicza, Raciborz, Sosnowiec, Myslowice, Ruda Slaska, Cieszyn
Sweden	25	25	25	75	Stockholm, Malmo, Uppsala, Umea, Gothenberg, Östersund
TOTAL				710	

Two different instruments were used to analyse the interview responses for Work Package 2:

- 1) Interpretative Grid – this was developed at the beginning of the Work Package on the basis of trials and reliability tests involving all participants conducted on the basis of transcripts and recordings of interviews already undertaken. An attempt was made to, wherever possible, close each of the interview questions set out in the questionnaire (anticipating and categorising likely answers). For all interviews undertaken by the national teams, the interviewers would use the grid to interpret the answers given by interviewees, and input the data given (i.e. the interviewees' responses) into a microsoft access database. However, for some questions, an attempt to close or pre-empt possible answers was seen as unfeasible or futile. For such questions, the decision was taken to leave answers open or to interpret through the 'frame analysis.'

2) Frame Analysis - a number of common frames were identified and refined following reliability tests in a workshop involving representatives of all partners held in October 2003. These were grouped under a number of master-frames: i) perceptions on the political system, ii) perceptions of Europe, iii) perceptions of public opinion, iv) perceived constituency and v) perspectives on the future. Using audio files of interviews, coders searched for excerpts corresponding to these frames. For each frame, at least 2 sentences/phrases were sought (containing the code and context; from a sound file there would be no more than 45 seconds per code). Two or three sentences/phrases (with a possibility of two codes for each sentence/phrase) needed to be cited for each of the five dimensions, each corresponding to one or two of the frames grouped under the dimension (containing the code and context; from a sound file there would be no more than 45 seconds per code). For each sentence, it was possible to identify two separate frames. The use of atlas.ti software allowed the selection and storage of the relevant sentences/phrases as 'quotations' using either audio files or transcripts (for perceptions on the political system, and perceptions on Europe, a maximum of three sentences were identified, i.e. 6 sentences in total, 12 possible frames, for the other three dimensions a maximum of two sentences were identified, i.e. 6 sentences in total, 12 possible frames, making 24 in total). The selected sentences/phrases were transcribed and translated into English. In order to do this, it was useful for the coder to first read/listen to the whole interview and then select the two main references to each dimension, in order to reduce the coding work. If no codes could be identified for a particular framing dimension, these stood as missing values. The Atlas.ti program was used for storing the relevant audio files and assigning the codes to the relevant excerpts for the frame analysis. This process was undertaken for 18 selected interviews (6 per sector) per country using digitally recorded audio files of the interviews.

The results of the interpretative grid and the frame analysis were sent by each of the partners to the co-ordinating team at Trento who used it as a basis for the comparative conclusions presented at the end of this overview section. However, national teams also sought to refer to these findings in the main text of their country reports which were based generally on interpretations of the interviews conducted in each country. The reports focused on the following themes: nature and structure of MACs in the policy sector (type of organisations, relationship to each other, style of leadership, accountability to members/supporters etc); issues and campaigns focused on by MACs in the policy sectors; assessment of public identification with MACs in the policy sector;

strategies employed by the MACs in the policy sector; perceptions as regards the openness/responsiveness of the political opportunity structure for MACs in the policy sector; assessment of the degree of common understanding among MACs and between MACs and institutional and other relevant actors in the policy sector; perceptions of the EU level of decision-making and involvement in EU level activism; and assessment of the general degree of success of MACs in the policy sector.

2. Work Package 3

Work Package 3 aimed at an analysis of the interaction between national SMOs/MACs and European Social Movement Organisations (EMOs) and the impact this relationship has. It analysed the intermingling of levels and spheres of civil-society organisation and its representation within a highly dynamic system of multi-level policy-making. The focus of this package was therefore on the nature of mediation between the national and European level of civil society.

Two groups of actors were interviewed:

- 1) *European intermediaries of national SMOs*: professional or voluntary activists of national SMOs that are specialised in European networking and/or European lobbying. These persons take part in European networking activities, follow closely European policy developments, etc. It was expected that only larger organisations at the national level could provide this form of specialisation.
- 2) *European institutional actors*: EU level actors that coordinate public relations and channel inputs from organised civil society. Examples include national MEPs who are specialised in one of our sub-sectors, governmental representatives within the Council, regional representatives, possibly national contact persons within the Commission.

The single country reports were based on interviews with 3-4 activists and 1-2 institutional actors for each sector making a total of 12-18 interviews for each team. The themes covered by the interview questionnaires and country reports were as follows:

- 1) Type of organisation (umbrella organisations, issue-advocacy networks, grassroots SMO)
- 2) Main activity (advocacy work, public campaigning, protest events, expertise, services)

- 3) European agenda of claims-making: Agenda-setting? Who defines contents of activities? How are policy positions agreed upon? Processes and channels of transnational interest formation
- 4) Strategies and tactics: What kinds of strategies of mobilisation/lobbying are applied? How successful are these strategies?
- 5) Degree of institutionalisation through involvement in formal/informal consultation. Closeness/distance to European governance. Partner or opponent?
- 6) Perceptions on European POS: uniform and formalised or divergent and dynamic? Open or closed? Transparent or opaque? Changes over time?
- 7) Horizontal relations (trans-European networking): interorganisational structure, allies or rivals, cooperation or conflict, fragmentation or integration
- 8) Vertical relations (multi-level networking): relation with the member or with associates at the national and subnational level, multi-level actions forms
- 9) Europeanisation-globalisation
- 10) Constituency: regional, national, transnational, sectoral
- 11) Perception of the future, main challenges: Constitutionalisation, Eastern enlargement, EU-WTO

Table 2. Interviews for Work Package 3

	Environmentalism	Regionalism	Anti-Racism	Total
Italy	8	14	5	27
Spain	7	7	4	18
Greece	-	-	-	7
France	9	10	5	24
Belgium	8	8	3	19
UK	11	9	4	24
Germany	5	5	6	16
Hungary	6	6	5	17
Poland	6	6	6	18
Sweden	6	6	6	12
TOTAL				188

3. Work Package 4

While Work Package 3 had focused on EU-national intermediaries as regards civil society organisations and their institutional counterparts, Work Package 4 focused on the direct interaction between EMOs and the European Institutions; and on the relationship between EMOs and the civil society interests they are supposed to represent. As in previous Work Packages the role of civil society organisations, in this case EMOs, was looked at from two perspectives; namely representativeness and political opportunity structures.

Interviews were used to understand the functioning of the POS and to get information on the internal dynamics of the EMOs that could not be found in the documents. In addition, interviews provided information on the perception of representativeness and POS by the policy actors themselves (EMOs and institutional actors). Most questions were framed so as to assess the 'perception' of policy actors. Some questions, though, were more specific in seeking, above all, to clarify how things work. The interviewees were invited to formulate more detailed and specific questions to get in particular a detailed assessment of POS in the concerned policy sector. Interviews were undertaken with both EMO representatives and institutional actors active at the European level. The number of actors involved was relatively small, so not as many interviews were required as for previous Work Packages.

Table 3. Interviews for Work Package 4

	Environmentalism	Regionalism	Anti-racism	Total
Number of Interviews	12	12	13	37

4. Findings of Project Workpackages

The findings of the various workpackages were integrated by the sectoral co-ordinators into overall sectoral overviews. For one of the sectors, anti-racism, there was little to distinguish between the actors in the two sub-sectors identified. Thus the anti-racism sector was considered as one integrated whole. For the environmental sector – two distinct sub-issues were identifiable. In some cases the policy actors were distinct, though in others there was a strong overlap. Thus a comparison between the two sub-sectors (GMO and transport infrastructure) was possible. However, for the regional sector, the sub-sectors (cultural/linguistic minorities and structural policy) were considered very distinct with entirely different actors operating. Thus separate analyses was required with two separate co-ordinators providing overviews of the work. Furthermore an additional overview is provided here of the EU level work, based on the findings of Work Package 4.

4.1. The Environmental Sector

4.1.1. Introduction

The two sub-issues (GMOs and transport respectively) are not always the central issues in the activity of the most important national and international environmental bodies. However, the study of both fields of environmental activity highlighted the different visions existing within European society concerning the relationship of the market and different economic interests to the environment. The central dividing axis swings between those who place the accent on the defence of balanced and ecological relations between society and nature, and those who argue that social welfare arises from freedom of movement and the free market, which bring economic growth. Although at present the critical voices that raise open criticism of the dynamics of economic development are not in a majority, a clear dissatisfaction can be noted with the priority given to the current ‘official’ parameters of economic growth in the EU. Among actors there is a division between groups of citizens organised at the local and regional level which, together with ecologist groups, farmers, consumers and also in some cases trade union organisations, confront the main economic actors that are accompanied by pro-car associations, scientists or pressure groups that defend the new transport routes or GMOs.

Nevertheless the degree of Europeanisation is quite dissimilar when we compare Transport and GMO sector activities and organisations. Transport infrastructures and regulations are linked to EU legislation also, but the relevance of the EU decision-making level and the coordination and common activity of the EMOs at the EU level is rather less important in comparison with the anti-GMO movements. Obviously, there are variations between countries. Sweden has been a member of the EU for only ten years and, according to the Eurobarometer (2005: 17), it remains the country showing the highest level of scepticism towards the EU among its citizenship; however, we can observe a high level of contact between the Swedish SMOs and European alliances and networks. On the contrary, Greece, which has been an EU member for twice as long, and with a population that is highly favourable to EU membership, shows a lower level of interest among environmental organisations in the EU dimension, and the lack of interaction between the EU and the national/local level is clear.

4.1.2. Organisations and campaigns

GMOs

In the European Union the controversy over GMOs has generated hundreds of groups and associations that argue against transgenics. While it is true that the novelty of the issue has resulted in the creation of new groups, the majority with a scientific interest and vocation, in general what we mainly find are groups of ecologists and farmers who are seeking varied alliances with a broad spectrum of social sectors that favour their demands. At stake is the European agricultural model, which is in crisis due among varied reasons, to food scandals, commercial relations between the USA and the EU, with the WTO in between, and the conflict between the different ways of understanding sustainability, that is to say, the relationships between the economy and ecology. This public controversy led the EU to approve a 5 year moratorium (1999-2004) in the agricultural sector on the introduction of GMOs for human consumption, that today has been replaced by a directive on the new conditions of production and commercialisation of these products.

In the German case, the debate over GMOs offers us a good example of the institutionalisation and professionalisation of ecologism. In Germany, the big companies with investments in GMOs, BASF and Bayer, have found their products confronted by opponents proceeding from three different origins. There are organisations from the ecologist movement (Greenpeace and BUND principally), and consumer organisations such as Verbraucher Initiative that demand reliable and neutral information on the GMOs and call for transparency in food labelling. Furthermore, there are development

organisations (ATTAC, Brot für die Welt, FIAN, Save our Seeds, AGROkultur) that direct their criticisms at unjust international trade, the property relations introduced by the GMOs and bio-piracy.

Beyond specific efforts and the existence of a fair number of local anti-transgenic initiatives, these organisations give their support to the GeN (Gen-ethisches Netzwerk – Gene-ethic Network), which aims to offer German society information and the opinions of experts proceeding from the administration, the political parties, educational and academic institutions and the mass media. This is a clear example of a movement advocacy coalition (MAC). Another would be the organisation Kein Patent auf Leben! (No Patents on Life!), which specialises in research and in judicial action against attempts to patent GMOs.

In the French case, the fragmentation shown by the anti-GMO scenario (Greenpeace and FoE/Confédération Paysanne/Coordination Rurale/Fed. Agriculture Biologique, ATTAC/Enc. des nuisances) has not prevented the formation of solid alliances and the setting up of different networks of collaboration like 'OGM dangers' or Inf'OGM, and in the last decade they have organised campaigns such as 'GMO alert' (1998) or 'No GMOs in my district' (2000). The latter campaign was able to collect the signatures of 3,000 French mayors in favour of GMOs-free areas. Besides, since the year 2002, the broad French anti-GMOs spectrum has united its efforts in the 'Agir pour l'environnement campagne', in an attempt to move beyond the European moratorium and to demand liabilities in the case of contamination by transgenic crops.

Even in countries like Greece, where it seems that GMOs have not been a priority in the environmental debate, that is to say, in a country where mobilisation against GMOs began relatively late – it was in 1996 that Greenpeace started to work on the question of the illegal import of GM corn – the year 2004 saw 142 associations set a campaign underway to declare Greece a GMOs-free territory.

One of the characteristics of the debate over the introduction of genetically modified organisms in Europe is, without doubt, the conceptual complexity of the subject in question and the difficulty faced by citizens in general in forming a clear opinion on such an intricate and complex topic. The complexity of understanding the basic concepts of genetics and the emergence of GMOs in European society recalls, in the opinion of some environmental activists, the start of the debate over nuclear energy in the 1960s and 1970s, when the companies involved in its development argued that this was a new technology about which only persons with scientific preparation could give an opinion.

Firstly, this has led the ecologist organisations and the new groups organised to protest against the introduction of GMOs to carry out an initial pedagogic work (Italy, Spain), which, in the opinion of its promoters, has obtained highly satisfactory results (interested persons and groups, alliances, favourable public opinion, etc.). In other cases, such as Poland, this complexity might be the cause of the lack of public interest in this question and be responsible for a decline in the attention paid to it. In general, the areas that have witnessed confrontations and campaigns over GMOs have been those of food, agriculture and science.

The food scandals (dioxins, mad cows, etc.) that have affected Europe in the last decade have led anti-GMO groups to demand proof of its harmlessness for human consumption, something that is constantly repeated by the pharmaceutical companies involved, but which is difficult to demonstrate without costly epidemiological studies.

Secondly, the controversy over transgenics has made itself felt in European agricultural policy; the agricultural sectors critical of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) are voicing their opposition to the introduction of these crops because of the increase in food insecurity, the logic of profit being placed before health and redistribution, the big corporations that market the seeds being favoured, and resources and knowledge being privatised. Furthermore, the polemic rises in tone when there is discussion of the possibility of combining traditional crops with transgenics.

This leads us to the third area of debate: science. Although we find scientists and studies that hold positions for and against, the transnational companies have been repeatedly denounced for putting pressure on universities and scientists to follow their script in the debate on GMOs. Facing those who argue that opinions can be offered and positions adopted only on the basis of solid scientific positions (the techno-scientific vision), there are those who argue that science is not neutral and that these new technologies, in spite of the serious risks they entail, are being supported by positions of social and economic power (the critical vision).

The big companies (Monsanto, Syngenta, DuPont, Bayer, BASF, Aventis, Dow Chemical, etc.) and the European ecologist organisations and their allies (MACs) have tried to give credibility to their positions with the support of different research, which has made evident a notable lack of scientific consensus. The former peremptorily need to recover the enormous capital investments they have made in genetic engineering over the last 30 years. They have high hopes of market success, but in Europe there has still not been sufficient commercialisation to meet their costs. Civil opposition to such market plans is demanding epidemiological studies that certify the innocuous character of such products

for human health and the ecosystems, something that would be excessively costly for the pharmaceutical companies.

In several countries this has led to the formulation of harsh criticisms of the role of scientists in the GMOs issue. In Italy, for example, the ecologist organisations have charged those scientists with 'irresponsibility' who, in their opinion, have abandoned their research role, their commitment to investigation and their role as experts in scientific matters, to become company men, investors seeking a business opportunity in GMOs. In the ecologists' opinion they have betrayed their deontology and have chosen the path of intellectual property, of biogenetic patents to enrich themselves without considering the possible harmful effects of commercialising GMOs. On the initiative of the ecologist movement in this country, the CDG (Council for Genetic Rights) has been formed. This is an independent body that is frontally opposed to the National Committee for Biosecurity and Biotechnologies.

At present, the techno-scientific argument in Europe revolves around whether or not it is possible to combine traditional crops with transgenics, without pollenisation contaminating the former. This coexistence, which is defended by some companies and their scientists, and that has yet to be proved and is called into question by the anti-GMO associations, means that in some countries, beyond the scientific argument, economic liabilities and reparations are being demanded for the already proven cases of agricultural contamination.

The moratorium of 5 years (1999-2004) has had a clear influence on the shaping of the political contradiction between forces that are pressing for the introduction of GMOs in the European market (the WTO, the USA government and the big GMOs companies) and those who oppose this introduction. In one sense, the EU has been the referential basis for the governments of countries like Hungary or Poland that entered the EU on 1st May 2004. For others, such as the Spanish state, the EU's preventing the admittance of GMOs has been, in the view of the environmental organisations, the central and single reason that blocked the intentions of the rightwing Popular Party government (Aznar) to open the door to GMOs. So, in Spain, as in other countries like Italy, Great Britain and the Netherlands, the EU moratorium and the later regulation which permits the cultivation of some GMOs are seen to be the result of the pressure of both a majority of European governments and the civic organisations that oppose their acceptance in our diet.

One of the battles still underway in some countries, such as Spain or France, is to ensure better transposition of the European directives. Some NGOs regret the limited nature of the sanctions imposed on member states in breach of the rules. In the Spanish case, the

opinion of the ecologists is that the new Spanish law represents a bad transposition that did not follow the European perspective in three aspects: the evaluation of the risk prior to authorisation, the follow-up once the transgenic organism is liberated and information to the public.

The European EMOs evidently disagree with the lifting of the de facto moratorium and refer to three points or shortcomings observed in the new EU regulations on GMOs. The first is the lack of legislation on responsibility for damages, the second the lack of regulations and measures for putting a brake on genetic contamination and the third concerns the rules on labelling.

At the European level, 50 national EMOs and MACs, and even international organisations and networks such as ANPED, A SEED or IFOAM (Organic Farmers), Greenpeace, FoE and WWF, are affiliated to GENET, a European network of non-governmental and non-profit making organisations engaged in the critical debate on genetic engineering, founded in 1995. GENET's main work is to provide information on genetic engineering for the member organisations and the interested public via email-lists and to coordinate activities and campaigns. At the moment, GENET has 50 member organisations in 24 European countries. The purpose of GENET is to exchange information on genetic engineering and campaigns. As can be read on its web page: "*by informing interested organisations and individuals it facilitates the citizens' involvement in decision-making processes which have to guide the development of this technology*". GENET supports activities that aim to avoid the introduction of products of gene technology that are not in the interest of consumers or farmers, harm the environment or animals, and conflict with human rights and ethics.

Transport

Mobility and sustainable transport have become new political objectives for the majority of the governments of the EU, which have been witness to the serious social, environmental and economic impact of the increase of motorisation, which is unstoppable and constantly requires new infrastructure, forming a vicious circle. For some of the activists who we interviewed in this work, transport is the *Gordian knot* of the socio-ecological crisis, since it is an activity that has an immense impact on nature; although for other social actors (technicians, economic and political agents) this is the normal way of domesticating nature and of achieving progress and market benefits.

In the last three decades, the increasing transport dynamic (private motorcars, aviation, goods transportation) has established a radical division between nature and society. The long list of external effects and complaints is not only environmental in character. Traffic

congestion represents a serious economic problem that must be added to infrastructure costs, noise, atmospheric pollution, climate change and accidents, which added together, represent a figure of between 7 and 10% of the combined GNPs of the EU according to the European Environment Agency.

On the other hand, over the last three decades there has also been a cultural and ideological change which sees an increase in transport as the necessary condition for economic growth and the resulting social welfare.

While transport is not a difficult sector or activity to define, its demarcation and its relations with other social areas entail a certain complexity. The activities linked to transport can be framed or conceptualised in very different ways depending on the type of actor involved and the social or scientific perspective from which it is approached, since each will observe and emphasise those characteristics of transport that hold the greatest interest for their own intentions. In our case, we will be considering its environmental expressions, with the necessary observation that its complexity does not diminish when considered from this particular perspective.

In the framework of the 10 countries of the EU included in our research, we can find very different types of activism and different fields of action where this activism has developed its campaigns and protests. Schematically, we can say that there basically exists at least one dividing line that separates two types of environmental protest in the transport sector.

Table 4. Two styles of campaigning in the transport sector

Direct action and critical standpoints	Pro-active and educational
Airport campaigns (F/G/UK/B)	Pedestrians, cyclists
High Speed trains/Skanlink	Public transport
Big controversies	Cultural activities

In the majority of the countries studied, we find these two ways for confronting the complex problems of transport. There is the reactive course, which generates controversies over those infrastructure projects that the environmental organisations and their allies consider most aggressive and that this study basically defines as protest campaigns against airports, new road infrastructure and high speed trains. Then there is the pro-active course, which seeks agreement and a conjunction of interests amongst the numerous social actors involved in transport (users and transport sector workers, the authorities, businesspeople, ecologists, residents of affected areas, etc.) and that tries to

promote new forms of mobility with less impact (non-motorised mobility, bicycle and pedestrian lanes, public transport, car-free neighbourhoods, road safety education), generating examples that provide an alternative to conventional transport.

In our study, we have paid considerably less attention to this second pro-active course because of the greater social and economic impact of the large-scale road infrastructures, where the interests at stake appear to be much greater, as are the social mobilisation and its repercussion in the mass media.

However, the separation between the two courses is not altogether clear-cut and we find ecologist groups and activists who work in both fields, who combine their activism against a specific airport or high-speed project with participation at the same in campaigns in favour of alternatives to motorised mobility. But there is a fairly clear delineation between the two fields of work.

Looking beyond the specific contents of the campaigns over transport, we find that in the majority of countries all types of strategy are combined: from the typical protest, which would include demonstrations, direct actions and non-violent protests, to participatory experiences, consultations and formal and non-conventional mediations, passing through judicial summons, lobbying and mass media campaigns.

It should be noted that the campaigns we have studied are concerned with different types of infrastructure, and that these campaigns are of different types, some national and international, others local in character. In countries such as Great Britain, Belgium, France and Germany airports have been the central axis selected. We have studied the protests arising over their functioning, mostly because of their noise and concerning new projects and enlargements, while in other countries it has been new road and high speed infrastructures that we have studied, or the problems caused by the private motorcar in cities. This might give rise to problems when it comes to elaborating our comparative work, but, if we remember that the aim of our research is to study the nature of the activism of civil society in the environmental field, the variety of forms of action and social representation is more important than an identity of issues from one country to another. Given the different social, environmental and transport realities in each of the ten countries, it would not be feasible to try and find common campaigns, above all given its local nature.

Table 5. Environmental organisations and campaigns

Country	Topics	Organisations (MACs)	Type of campaigns
Germany	Airports	Burgerinitiativen, affected communities, networks (noise) and ecologists	Reactive
Italy	Sustainable transport, private car - city	National (WWF, Legaambiente, I.Nostra, Friends of the Earth), local committees (Udine, Naples)	Reactive and pro-active
Poland	Trains and new motorways	Ecological Club, Green Federation, Gaia Club	Pro-active
Belgium	Airports	Affected communities, networks (noise) and ecologists	Reactive
Hungary	Railway, taxes, bicycles	National and regional ecologists, Traffic Club, Cyclists' organisation	Pro-active
France	Airports	Local groups, elected officials, federations,	Reactive
G. Britain	Airports & public transport.	FoE, Transport 2000, Sustrans, CPRE, SSE-Local	Pro-active
Greece	Pollution, congestion,	Local groups	Pro-active
Sweden	Global climate change, local congestion, Skanlink	SSNC, FoE, Greenpeace, Green Motorists, Kollektivtrafikant	Pro-active
Spain	High speed train, infrastructures, alternative forms of transport	Ecologistas en Acción, Trade Unions, PTP, local platforms	Reactive

On the other hand, we must draw attention to the fact that in several countries, both in the West of Europe (France, Spain, Italy) and in the East (Poland, Hungary) the largest European ecological organisations (Greenpeace, WWF), or others that are important at a national or state level, do not give priority to acting in the transport field, or else have a tangential presence in such campaigns.

The environmental groups consulted are pessimistic. Transport activities and plans are growing without pause and most of the European people think that this is synonymous with a better standard of living. In Poland, for example, entry into the EU is presumed to be an opportunity to overcome the situation of poor condition of roads, low functioning and competitiveness of the railways, and congestion. But the first environmental changes are going in a mistaken direction, with a great importation of private cars that has produced an increase in individual motorisation and a decrease in the use of public

transport. The Polish Strategy of Development of Transport Infrastructure (2004-2006) established as its main objectives the intensification of business exchange, economic growth and development of the regions. While the above objectives have probably been fulfilled, security and the elimination of accidents, or the lowering of environmental costs, all of which were also included as objectives, have not been achieved.

In the other corner of Europe, in the United Kingdom in the 1990s, an important shift occurred in transport policy. The traditional 'predict and provide' model of transport planning was abandoned and the supply of new infrastructures is not seen anymore as the only solution, the only available answer to the expectations and needs for mobility. The government changed from the 'Roads to Prosperity' White Paper of 1989, to 'A New Deal for Transport' White Paper of 1998, giving certain recognition to the strong mobilisation against roads at the local level. Transportation has also increased as an issue of public controversy. While there are growing expectations amongst the citizens about personal travel for holidays and mobility between home, work and leisure opportunities, at the same time concern about the environmental impact of the transport system and infrastructures is growing.

In Spain, according to environmentalist voices, the 'Strategic Infrastructure and Transport Plan 2005-2020 (PEIT)' is a continuation of the policies of the previous government that envisages the construction of 6,000 km of motorway in the first years of its coming into effect. In the opinion of Friends of the Earth, Ecologists in Action, Greenpeace, SEO/Birdlife and WWF/Adena, if these projects are carried out, the territory will be seriously affected, many ecosystems will become fragmented, including the Nature Network 2000, and there will be an increase in the use of the private car and of emissions of CO₂ and other polluting gases and particles.

In a northern country like Sweden, where half of the population are of the opinion that their nation experiences losses and disadvantages through their membership of the EU, the environmentalists think that the European Union is at the same time a source of transport problems and a more comprehensive arena for solving those difficulties. The Single Market brought an increase of transport with its negative environmental effects, and fiscal regulations such as the distance tax (kilometerskatt) were dropped when Sweden entered the EU. But, on the other hand, the Swedish government, like the Swedish car industry, is playing an obstructing role with respect to the implementation of a tougher carbon dioxide tax.

4.1.3. Public identification and public opinion

GMOs

Without doubt, the food scandals that have occurred over the last decade in Europe have been decisive for European public opinion when weighing up the introduction of GMOs. But, in any case, the anti-GMO social movements have been particularly careful in their mobilising and communicational strategies that their positions should be perceived positively by civil society. Thus, the environmental collations and alliances have managed to introduce a question onto the political and media agenda whose comprehension by the public is problematic, and their positions have won support from the European public.

In the opinion of the ecologists, this is an issue that is difficult to deal with in a simple and educational way; it is an issue subject to manipulation from different quarters. Thus some of the reasons for understanding public support for the anti-GMOs theses must be sought in the way in which the movement has worked with the sectors most directly involved and also with the mass media. In Great Britain, centrist national newspapers like *The Independent*, or right-wing newspapers like *The Daily Mail* have clearly positioned themselves against "Frankenstein food" (*Daily Mail*). This type of posture by the mass media has helped to bring about a situation where only 2% of the population was willing to eat GM foods.

In Germany in the year 2000, 23.2% considered GMOs to be highly dangerous, 31.9% very dangerous, and 25.3% somewhat dangerous (80.4% of the total), which shows the concern and growing rejection by the public of the largest European country (ALLBUS 2000). Of great assistance in this, without any doubt, was the presence of the Green Renate Kunast, responsible for the Ministry of Consumers, in the large German coalition (MAC) against GMOs.

The same occurred in the French case. The arrival of Corinne Lepage at the Ministry of the Environment in 1995 brought strong support to the anti-GMOs struggle in spite of strong opposition from the Agricultural Ministry. In France, the activists believe that their great success is due to their having been able to make the GMO-issue into a public controversy, bringing an invisible issue into the light. And on the other hand, they managed to link GMOs to health and policies entailing environmental and social risk. That figures of world renown, such as José Bové (*Via Campesina*) or Lord Peter Melchet (*Greenpeace*), have taken part in direct actions against transgenic crops, been put on trial and acquitted, has also served to place the issue on the agenda of the mass media and strengthen public opposition to transgenics.

The GMO debate has not had the same intensity in all the countries. In Eastern and Southern European countries, considered by environmentalists themselves as having less public concern on ecological issues, there have been more difficulties in provoking public debates and the reception of the issue by the mass media.

The 1999 Eurobarometer survey asked Europeans to say a) which of 12 sources of information on biotechnology they trusted most and then b) which other sources they also trusted. The combined responses (a + b) showed that industry and political parties were perceived as the least trustworthy of the sources listed. Only 3% of Europeans quoted them as a trusted source, as opposed to consumer organisations and environmental organisations that 55% and 45% of Europeans, respectively, said they trusted. However, the result recorded for industry was a little better in some countries, such as the Netherlands, Belgium, Luxembourg and Finland (Eurobarometer, 2000).

Transport

While the divide between environmentalist and actors representing industry is similar to that on the GMO issue, a clear difference in the case of the transport sector is the role played by public opinion. In this case, the environmentalists do not appear to be representing the opinion of the public - the majority of people are not keen on giving up their car or paying for the environmental burden that motorisation causes.

Environmental organisations are at an unquestionable disadvantage when it comes to counterbalancing the popularity of cheap flights, the widespread idea that new infrastructural developments will bring a better quality of life and greater mobility, and so on. In this sense, local grass-roots movements are pessimistic about EU policy because the transport dynamics are far too important to economic development and it appears that environmental and social criteria are not sufficiently strong to prevent this *sustained growth*.

Transport is a sector where the ecologists find a public that is very receptive and concerned with the problems but not particularly willing to adopt the postulates that attempt to calm traffic. In this context, the groups and persons involved in the search for a sustainable transport model draw attention to the imbalance between what is supported in theory by part of public opinion in their respective countries, and the normal practice of the majority of the population.

Perhaps because of this discrepancy between theory and practice, this alarming gap between reality and desire, European ecologism tends to organise campaigns in favour of local sustainable mobility, trying to find in the local spaces the necessary support for

opening alternative paths. Besides, as we shall see, there are numerous reactive campaigns and conflicts opposing transport infrastructure plans that threaten the quality of life of the affected communities; these have given rise to a myriad of NIMBY style campaigns that mobilise many persons and collectives, although locally.

4.1.4. Strategies, advocacies and opportunities

GMOs

Conscious since the early 1990s of the difficulties in explaining the foundations of genetic engineering to the general public, and starting its work with aims of providing information and education, anti-GMO activism in Europe has attempted to reach social sectors that are prone to a greater understanding and defence of its proposals, sectors whose actions and positions would be of greater relevance facing the possible introduction of GMOs. Thus, the social sectors targeted by its messages and campaigns are principally the farmers, who appear to have much at stake in this issue; the food producers and the consumers, both consumers' associations and the public of the big commercial centres; mothers and women responsible for feeding families or working in school refectories; and international solidarity and development aid groups, which are prepared to demonstrate that there is an important North-South dimension behind the GMOs question. In this latter respect, the anti-globalisation movements, or movements for global-social justice, have placed the denunciation of the GMO industry in the front line of their protests, making the cultivation of transgenic plants one of the larger symbols of the anti-globalisation discourse.

With their sights set on these social sectors, the organised campaigns have been gradually directed towards different aims. Initially, it was *informative* campaigns that opened the way; in a second phase, work was begun against *patents* on life; later, there were boycotts and denunciation of the *import of transgenic* products, basically maize and soya, and also actions directed against *fields* where crops were being cultivated, to finally start to propose *transgenic-free areas*.

In general, in reviewing the ten countries that have been studied, we find – and this is very different in the case of the transport sector as we shall see – a very mixed political opportunity structure (POS). If we divide it into three levels, local, regional and central, the POS is highly influential in the latter two strata, while it is less important in the local setting. This is not to say that anti-GMO social movements have not achieved the support of thousands of local corporations and mayors in their campaigns for transgenic-free zones, but that the actions and campaigns, the political decisions and the political allies

that have made a real contribution, have been developed at the regional and central levels.

The countries studied present a diverse reality. Germany is a country where the central political opportunity structure has been very profitable, with the German anti-GMO movement finding support from Green ministers, who, besides maintaining a fluid relationship and permanent informal consultations, have requested the services, as well as reports and advice, from expert members of the anti-GMO movement. In Belgium, parallel to the governmental initiatives for controlling the GMO sector, interest groups started to increase pressure on companies and exert a policy influence on the 'Rainbow' government during 1999-2003. Because of the conflict between, on one side, the Greens (ECOLO and Agalev) together with the Socialists (PS and SP-A) voicing environmental and health concerns, and often opposing GMOs, and, on the other side, the Liberals (VLD and PRL) advancing liberal economic arguments and defending the interests of multinationals, the GMOs issue was often a source of conflict in the government. Environmental conflict became the Achilles' heel of the coalition, which when it overlapped with transport concerns eventually led to the fall of the Rainbow government.

In Italy, with an Agricultural Ministry favourable to the defence of traditional agriculture and opposed to transgenics, and in spite of having obtained an unprecedented degree of collaboration both from the political class (policy makers) and from business groups such as COOP (Food distribution), in the opinion of activists there has not been a sufficient opening, nor has there been a suitable institutional policy forthcoming from the government in Rome. This means that the most favourable terrain for anti-GMOs work has been the regions (Piedmont, Veneto).

The British case presents us with a different face. Here, the response from the New Labour government was to impose a five year freeze on the commercialisation of transgenic products, to provide an adequate response to the rejection of GMOs by the majority of British society, and in the same period it carried out 5 experiments with transgenic crops (trial plots). In January 2004, the ACRE commission, which had been following the 5 experiments, issued its verdict according to which two crops were harmful for the environment, although a transgenic maize crop appeared to be more beneficial than the traditional varieties. This has led the Blair government to support biotechnologies and to support genetically modified maize, with the argument that public opinion will gradually be worn down with time. At the regional level, all of Wales and a quarter of England have been declared transgenic-free areas, although the Greens and the Scottish Socialist party have been the only allies/defenders of the anti-GMO movement.

Sweden is a country where there has not been any great controversy over the GMO question. The panorama there is very different, partly because of its neo-corporative model for managing the public administration, and partly due to the sceptical attitude of the agro-alimentary industry. This is due in part to the existence of a broad and strategically successful social mobilisation, as a result of which there have only been small, controlled experiments with transgenics. This is very different to what happened in Spain, where the Spanish central government (during the 8 years of the Aznar government) has been the central enemy of the movement, leading the ecologists to talk of a regression in its relations with the central government. In autonomous regions such as Andalusia or the Basque Country, governed by the socialists (PSOE) and by nationalists (PNV) respectively, the anti-GMO movement has not found firm allies, but at least they have been permitted to express their opinions before within the institutions.

Neither in Poland nor in Hungary has the GMO issue had a strong social impact. In the Hungarian case, however, in 1998 the central government instituted a moratorium in line with the EU policy, and in 1999 it set up an advisory committee involving ecologist organisations and consumers.

Transport

Major environmental groups (Greenpeace or WWF, for example) only approach transport in a tangential way, when it affects certain natural areas or in its relation to global climate change, for example, and do not yet consider it to be a priority sector, although this is slowly changing. It is normal to find groups of the population affected by sound or atmospheric pollution, or by some other type of environmental aggression, who seek to form an alliance with environmental organisations, in order to obtain a greater capacity for influence or pressure. There are many cases where the ecologist associations have criticised the NIMBY dimension of many campaigns in the transport sector - which raise their voice over a specific complaint, but then demobilise when that complaint is passed on to another locality.

Another characteristic that can be observed in transport campaigns is the greater ease with which allies are found amongst the local rather than the central authorities. Transport is too central a sector in the economy for the state institutions to call into question certain mobility initiatives that involve very high budgets. In any case, eco-fiscal policies, such as that set underway in the City of London (2004) are a reference point for European ecologism as a whole because of their symbolic role as a positive and feasible alternative.

For the activists of sustainable transport, the mass media are at times a vital ally for diffusing their proposals, which is why they seek collaboration in the task of educating and re-orientating citizens in the ways of using transport. But, on other occasions, since they are companies that carry both commercial and institutional publicity and advertising, the mass media are viewed as part of the problem and not as the solution.

The campaigns developed in the transport sector make use of legal tools and paths in the majority of cases for mobilising around their interests. But, on certain occasions, they employ innovative actions that attract attention and awaken interest, both in the mass media and in public opinion, giving rise to debate and the expression of social opinions on the question of interest to the activists. In the countries of the North and East of Europe, public opinion does not normally view actions of civil disobedience favourably, but the latter obtain their effect in the media and they accompany the legal activity of other environmental sectors which are respectful of order.

With respect to the political opportunity structure in the transport sector, the varied panorama offered by the numerous campaigns and alliances promoted by European environmentalism tends, in general, to find a more favourable terrain and to widen its base of action at the local and regional levels. However, in certain countries (Sweden and Great Britain, for example) the central government structures acquire a greater dimension and exercise a greater attraction for the social movements and their campaigns, rather than local and regional government structures. In general, the local levels are the appropriate places for finding both social and political allies - even in the institutional and administrative framework - for confronting the transport plans, normally designed or funded by the state authorities and supported economically from Brussels.

In the British case, for example, the Labour government, just as occurred with previous Conservative governments in the past, concentrates 90% of the state transport budget in the hands of the central government, which means that the eyes of the activists are turned to the London government as it is responsible for transport policy. The evaluation of relations with the central government is not favourable, since the Transport Ministry has repeatedly reacted with hostility to local and regional ecologist proposals. It is at these levels where alliances with other sectors are easier to form and function in a more positive way, although the environmental activists are aware of the danger of becoming co-opted in formal decision-making processes.

The corporatist and consensus nature of decision-making in Belgium has integrated environmentalist movements, and especially the umbrella organisations, quite rapidly into the decision-making process. The new regional administrations with powers

concerning environmental matters also often recruited (former) activists of environmental movements as civil servants or members of their ministerial cabinets. With respect to the disputes among political elites, having lost the project of completely banning night flights, former Transport Minister and Francophone Green Party ECOLO member Isabelle Durant modified and narrowed the flightpaths of the belt of the northern Flemish communes in October 2002. The typical Belgian governmental row over this decision, where she was defeated by government decree, eventually led to her resignation and the electoral "punishment" of the Green parties at the most recent elections and thereby their exclusion from the current government.

In the Spanish case, the political opportunity structure in Madrid is also very closed, somewhat more open at the regional or autonomous levels, and genuinely open for collaboration in some municipalities and counties, where the impact of infrastructures of top-down design and imposition is facilitating alliances and the building of local MACs. There is an important state-level network or platform in favour of the train, and another in the Basque Country, directly confronting the High Speed projects. In Italy, the evaluation by the groups and persons interviewed is that the political systems at both the central and local levels are closed to their demands and arguments, and this situation is worsening at present since the government holds a favourable position to transport (the bridge at Messina, Mose in Venice, Corridor 5 in the North of Italy).

In France, the evaluation of the activists is that in spite of the partial success of their activity - they have carried out several processes of consultation and have put a stop to several new airport projects, for example - the structures and practices of consultation continue to be consultative and discretionary, without any decision-making capacity for the social movements. The Swedish case is certainly different. Here we find a corporative system that tends to consult and seek points of negotiation and consensus with the most representative ecologist organisations. Thus, the ancient and broad Swedish Society for Nature Conservation (SSNC) functions as the principal axis for social contact for the Administration. There are other groups and campaigns (FoE, Greenpeace, Natural Steep, Green Motorists and Kollektivtrafikant), but they do not play the same role with respect to the political system as the SSNC.

4.1.5. The perception and relevance of EU policy-making

GMOs

Just as the political opportunity structure (POS) is different in each state, the perception and evaluation of the role played by the European Union varies in the different countries where activists were consulted. Also different is the form in which the national

organisations and campaigns have become involved in European alliances and contacts. But the EU is the best place for bringing pressure to bear. Even with the open criticism of it being an opaque and distant body that is also not very democratic, EMOs and their surrounding MACs are aware that Brussels is a key point for action, principally because it is where the initial and final steps of the legislative process are made.

Ecologists are aware that their pressure against the commercialisation of GMOs should be developed as a double force exerted through national and European institutions at the same time; but because the EU institutions are situated far away, they have to implement special skills and care to achieve results in Brussels. They realise that in some cases their own national governments are fundamental in decision-making, so they have to undertake double work. On some occasions nevertheless, they have been forced to take their demands to the EU, by-passing the national level, which means more human resources and economic funds dedicated to EU level activities. It is an option that local and regional campaigns normally cannot afford.

The most optimistic representatives of the environmental organisations consider that the EU institutions are defending the same positions as them in the GMO field, but obviously with different means and methods. In their view, there are shared objectives and goals but with diverse roles that have to be complementary.

Other environmentalists, on the contrary, consider that, apart from DG Environment, most of the DGs, and the Parliament and the Council are more open to industrial lobbies, showing an ideological refusal of the views held by the environmental organisations. In the view of these critical organisations there is a special interest in the GMO debate to show that the possible dangers of the GMOs are not related to the environment. From this perspective, the EU framing activity on the GMOs issue focuses almost exclusively on the potential risk for human health and for food safety and environmental subjects such as biodiversity remain outside the debate.

In general, we can assert that the 5 year moratorium on GMOs decreed by the EU (1999-2004) has been positively interpreted by the anti-GMO activists. However, as Brussels is a place where, in their opinion, the powerful pharmaceutical lobbies can put pressure to bear easily and with considerable weight, the European political future of transgenics is viewed with concern. To this pressure must be added that of the WTO and the free trade demands of the USA, as well as the institutional changes due to the widening of the EU that is giving shape to a new terrain of play.

We also find a large number of groups and campaigns that are organised locally or regionally with a global discourse, but which make the self-criticism that they do not pay

sufficient attention to the "distant" European political dynamics, or that they have recourse to the European networks in search of information or documentary support for their own local struggles, while leaving the global work in the hands of the few experts of the international organisations.

With respect to the role that the EU has played, and continues to play in this issue, some activists from Germany underscore the existence of an interesting flow and exchange of communication, although they report that the structures of the EU are more closed than those of Federal Germany. In Hungary, for example, it is considered that the issue is totally linked to the interests of the agricultural market and that the real option faced by Europe is either to finance the GMOs or to defend traditional crops. The ecologists of the Spanish state have seen in the European moratorium a shield protecting their positions, but they do not hesitate to describe the European Commission as pro-GMO and as a defender, in the first place, of economic privileges, which is why they express pessimism over the political future of the EU with respect to GMOs. In their opinion, an unequal battle is being fought over the privatisation of life, in which the EU leaders are placing commercial interests before social and environmental concerns. In Poland, while the GMO regulatory bodies boast of having a more restrictive legislation, offering greater protection and more cautiousness than EU legislation, the activists continue to think that this is too permissive. In Sweden we find an anti-GMO movement that is highly critical of the EU and that offers an evaluation of the EU that varies depending on the experience of the activists interviewed.

Transport

A large proportion of the activists consulted had a paradoxical ambivalence in relation to the role played by the EU in the transport issue. The advantages on the side of the EU institutions are mostly the existence of global regulations, good, unified and strict environmental regulations and normally a more open decision-making process with more access to propositions and participation by civil society. On the list of disadvantages, the ecologists cited that the European decision-making process is not capable of seeing peculiarities or specificities, which are reserved to national states, and in consequence they do not concern themselves with the local problems in every region. Another disadvantage would be bureaucratisation, which will increase with the enlargement to 25 states, and, finally, the environmentalists criticise the huge distance between the decision-making bodies and the people concerned.

On one side, the EU promotes and funds the majority of infrastructure developments to which the ecologist movements and their allies (MACs) are opposed; at the same time, it

is the final instance or step to which they can have recourse to try and stop those projects. The ecologist critique emphasises that the existence of progressive legislation and political orientations does not fit in well with the design of the new Transeuropean Networks, which in their opinion are being imposed through the pressure exercised in Brussels by business lobbies, principally the European Roundtable of Industrialists.

Europe is thus an ambivalent factor, a dual institution, which finances problematic projects and, at the same time, it is the instance where arguments can be brought that state or regional institutions have refused to listen to. In this context, there have been frequent occasions when the European authorities have recommended, both to the environmental associations and to the national authorities themselves, the need to resize projects and seek consensus and points of agreement that would make certain transport projects less socially and environmentally costly.

For national and sub-national activists, the EU was often not seen as particularly relevant to local issues of concern. In the view of the EMO representatives interviewed, the EU institutions offer an uncertain, ambivalent and ambiguous institutional framework, with opportunities and obstacles. Generally speaking, Brussels is viewed as a more open political structure but with a huge and complex bureaucracy, where the DG Environment is named as the most participatory institution, more open than DG TREN or DG TAX for example. Nonetheless, in the opinion of some environmentalists, this openness is because of its own interest in gaining social pressure facing the EU institutions. In relation to the Parliament, the rate of openness to taking civil opinions into account depends on certain MEPs who have to be informed and orientated by the know-how present in civil society. The Council of Ministers is seen as more problematic and less appropriate for SMO inputs.

4.1.6. Alliances and networks at the EU level

Environmentalists started to work in offices in Brussels more than 30 years ago, even before other trade unionist, industrial or social organisations. The European Environmental Bureau (1974) is evidence of this. Subsequently, Friends of the Earth Europe (1985) Greenpeace (1988) and WWF (1989) also became established at the European political capital and started to collaborate among themselves, establishing in the mid 1990s a "joint venture" called the Green 7, formed by these four international groups together with Climate Network Europe, Birdlife International and the Transport & Environment Federation. This European green lobby has since then been enlarged with the incorporation of two new European federations, the International Federation of Friends of Nature based in Vienna and the Environmental Network of the European

Physicians Association (EEN), and more recently CEE Bankwatch³, to become the Green 10, a green umbrella that represents around 20 million people, in their own estimation; but the strength of this European environmental alliance is relatively small in comparison with industrial lobbies that possess many more personal, financial and structural resources and skills for operating in the European capital.

In the last decade, the internet has meant a great leap forward in ameliorating the conditions of common work and the possibility of daily interaction among environmental groups; it is a tool for reinforcing local and international campaigns, but still there are language problems that make difficult a stronger approach to the European dimension of green cooperation.

GMOs

Anti-GMO movements in Europe are a bottom-up dynamic of collaboration, between ecologists and organic farmers principally, but consumers' associations and solidarity and anti-globalisation groups as well. However, the EU decision-making level has been especially relevant for both the forces in dispute. Ecologists were forewarned years ago that Monsanto, Novartis, Singenta, Dow, Basf or Aventis, with the approval of the United States of America, would have to be confronted over GMOs at the entrance to the EU institutions. And when powerful agro-industrial lobbies started to knock at the doors of the EU, a kind of common awareness produced a willingness to unite together in the face of the enemy.

This does not mean that the anti-GMO movement has always had a single position. Within the greens the strategy, demands and stances of the outright rejectionists differ from those of the reformists who argue that solutions will come step by step. The former position is building upon ethical and ecological principles and the second on consumer and health reasons, but in most of the cases the European movement against transgenics has acted in a unified way, avoiding internal crisis in the face of such a vigorous enemy.

Based on cooperative feelings and horizontal network dynamics of collaboration, this movement has produced a successful cluster or coalition of associations working at the EU level. The mortar for building up these new alliances of EMOs in Europe has been the internet. The use of this new tool has produced a rapid spread of knowledge and information, making possible daily communication at low costs. Genet is one of the best expressions of that cooperative task. Dedicated to collecting and spreading information

³ The CEE Bankwatch Network is devoted to preventing environmentally and socially harmful impacts of international development finance, and to promoting alternative solutions and public participation

on this complex issue for 10 years, it has created two email lists: GENET-news, open to every subscriber; and GENET-forum, an internal list devoted to strategy discussions and political evaluations amongst members.

This grass-root cooperation has been used to pave the way for Eastern countries also. Countries remaining outside the de facto EU moratorium have had less legal difficulties in the introduction of GMOs. In this sense collaborative work has included EMOs and campaigns in Poland and Hungary. The relationship of the national organisations to these Brussels based offices will be directly related to their political disposition and human and financial capacities. National groups and campaigns against GMOs usually approach Brussels along two separate routes, one directed to big umbrella organisations such as the EEB of the farmers federation CPE and the other to the most relevant EU international organisations in this field, Greenpeace and FoE Europe.

Table 6. Horizontal and vertical European links of the Anti- GMO groups

Country	Interviewed organisations	Horizontal links towards EU	Vertical links towards EU
Sweden	SSNC- Greenpeace	EEB	Greenpeace
Spain	EeA, Amigos d.Tierra, Greenpeace, EHNE	EEB, CPE, Genet, ANPED	FoE, Greenpeace
G.Britain	FoE, Greenpeace	EEB	FoE, Greenpeace
Greece	Greenpeace		Greenpeace
Poland	Polish Ecological Club, Polish Green Network, Greenpeace	EEB, IFOAM, ANPED	Greenpeace
Hungary	MTVSZ, CEE web, REC	Genet, EEB, Eastern networks	FoE, Greenpeace
Belgium,	Greenpeace, Nature et Progress	CPE	Greenpeace
Germany	DNR, BUND, Greenpeace	EEB (12), Genet, Green Week,	Greenpeace, FoE
Italy	WWF, Greenpeace		WWF, Greenpeace
France	InfoGM, Agir pour l'Environment	EEB- Genet	Green 9

In the view of the European environmentalists fighting against GMO commercialisation, the European institutional structures are open but not properly designed to permit the presence of civil society and the participation of its representatives in the decision-making process. Their input is based on informal contacts, lobbying and personal relations that in many cases did not evolve into positive regulations.

As the table above reflects, Greenpeace plays a central role as the international organisation that brings together the most voices against GMOs in Europe. In spite of a long lasting collaboration with the Green 10 on the issue, there is an important difference between Greenpeace and the other European federations, in the view of some critical representatives of national SMOs. Mainly referring to the EEB, some green voices declare that Brussels-based teams are in danger or at risk of becoming “money driven actors”, with a limited independence of action because of their economic dependence on the EU funds.

Transport

Unlike the GMO sector, in the transport sector there is a general ambivalence towards the EU among national/sub-national activists as it is not seen as relevant for local campaigns. Nevertheless, while still at a low level of development, European wide social networks and environmental campaigns in the transport sector are beginning to get off the ground. Some interesting experiences are mentioned by the activists working on airports with reference to the European Union Against the Harmful Effect of Planes. Besides these ad hoc federations, also important are the constant contacts of coordination between the big international ecologist groups, the so-called European ecologist GREEN 9, and, specifically in the field of transport, the groups make a positive evaluation of the lobbying work of the European federation Transport & Environment based in Brussels, despite the fact that its power is still small in comparison with the industry pressure groups.

On the other hand, national and international SMOs, like Greenpeace, WWF or FoE, are only marginally concerned with transport issues. As the following table shows, and in comparison with the GMO sector, horizontal and vertical links of EMOs working on the transport issue are weak and little developed. The European Environmental Bureau and especially the Transport and Environment European Federation are the two horizontal networks that are referential for local and national transport environmental campaigners.

Table 7. Horizontal and vertical European links of the transport environmental organisations and campaigns

Country	Interviewed organisations	Horizontal links in EU	Vertical links in EU
Sweden	SSNC, Greenpeace, Acid Rain	EEB, T&E	Greenpeace
Spain	EeA, PTP, Train Platform	EEB, T&E	
G.Britain	Local NIMBYs	Greenskies	
Greece			
Poland	Business Consultative Body, LMKS, Greenpeace	EEB,T&E	Greenpeace
Hungary	LMKS, MKK, Kerosz cyclists	EEB, T&E	
Belgium	BBL, IEB, BRAL		
Germany	Bund, VCD, BVF	EEB (12), T&E, UECNA	FoE
Italy	WWF, FoE	EEB	WWF, FoE
France	UFCNA-UFNASE-FNE	UECNA	

The EEB has no *ad hoc* working group on transportation - they have working groups on air quality, noise, environmental fiscal reform and industry - but its members are accustomed to working alongside T&E. Transport & Environment is a single issue professional network that campaigns on transport, with some 40 non-governmental members in 20 countries. T&E activities are organised in two perspectives: from the small secretariat in Brussels and from the member organisations' campaigns, cooperation and information exchange take place with their own decision makers at the national level.

These two umbrella organisations are dedicated to informal lobbying and to organising conferences and events across Europe. Despite the low level of contacts between local and regional transport campaigns and the European-based umbrella NGOs, T&E or EEB are seen as solid and democratic, representing the voice and the interests of environmentally-minded civil society.

4.1.7. Europeanisation of environmental civil society

Despite the difficulties and troubles that national environmental organisations must overcome to arrive in Brussels and make contact with a European umbrella organisation, or single, big environmental organisation or even with the EU institutions, most of the SMOs' representatives agree that EU level action is very important, basically because

80% of environmental legislation proceeds from there and in a short time must be transposed to national laws.

Nevertheless the degree of Europeanisation is quite dissimilar when we compare Transport and GMO sector activities and organisations. Transport infrastructures and regulations are linked to EU legislation as well, but the relevance of the EU decision-making level and the coordination and common activity of the EMOs at the EU level is rather less important in comparison with the anti-GMO movements.

Europeanisation of the policy areas related to GMOs is not only desirable but is already a reality. SMOs have actively contributed to the achievement of this, frequently by-passing the national level, which is considered to be more closed and bureaucratised than the European one, as the Italian Greenpeace and WWF activists pointed out.

More than a European virtue, this is seen by some environmentalists as a necessity that has had to be won as some national governments and parliaments (Italy, Spain, Poland) did not offer a positive political opportunity structure. Anyway, the people asked by the Eurobarometer (May, 2005) perceived the role of the EU in environmental matters as legitimate. Asked about the level most suited to providing solutions for the protection of the environment, 45% of interviewees responded that this was the EU, 37% the national government, and 15% the regions.

The environmentalists suggest that this Europeanisation process is mostly due to the activism of an elite of ecologists, members and representatives of the bigger national EMOs, of whom there are few in every country, but who are networking in a clever and collaborative manner. But they did not conceal the great difficulties, human and economic, that are faced if they are to act in Brussels with massive resources.

EU political structures are still seen as being situated far away, as something complex and difficult to access by many grass-roots environmental groups, and in order to combat this feeling national green umbrella organisations in Germany and France - Deutscher Naturschutzring and France Nature Environment for instance - organise courses and workshops to inform their supporters on the functioning of the EU, which is mentioned as a tool for capacity building for more effective lobbying, and to recruit activists for these areas of engagement. As a side effect, German environmentalists consider that civil society acquires an educational role and becomes a mean of amplifying specific European positions, thus increasing the transparency of EU policy-making.

The Europeanisation of the anti-GMOs campaigns has operated vertically and horizontally. In some countries, due to the pre-eminence of organisations such as

Greenpeace, Friends of the Earth affiliates and WWF groups, networking activities have been oriented to introducing national and regional claims at the European level, while horizontal collaboration through networks such as GENET, EEB or CPE has produced common standpoints for operating in EU domains and below.

After the lifting of the moratorium, the new strategy of opposition to the introduction of GMOs fits with the characteristics of the Europeanisation process. Transgenic Free Zones, from hundreds of localities to European regions (Acquitaine, Limousin, Upper Austria, Salzburg, Tuscany, Marches, Wales, Thrace-Rodopi, Schleswig-Holstein, Euskadi) and eventually some state-members of the EU, such as Austria and Greece, demand European legal and institutional support for their determination to be free of GMOs.

This alliance of European environmentalists with local and regional authorities supposes a kind of sandwich between the local and the global, that beyond by-passing some national pro-GMO governments, might result in a new bottom-up approach that views the EU as an object of criticism with growing decision-making powers.

In this sense, and in spite of the unequal resources in comparison with the transnational GMO enterprises - with their economic, human and material means for organising lobbying activities in Brussels and at the national level - the EU institutions are the best ally of the EMOs for confronting the pressure of the industrial and political interests proceeding from WTO, USA and the multinational pharmaceutical enterprises.

According to some researchers on EMOs, the formation of these pan-European environmental federations is clear evidence of the so called Europeanisation phenomenon, but it would be a mistake to consider that this simply emerged as a result of internationalist idealism (Rootes, 2002). However, the Europeanisation of environmentalism means that more groups co-ordinate their activities across national borders, engage in EU policy matters, target EU institutions and concentrate resources in Brussels.

The main reason for this is more functional and is based on the evidence that the EU represents the core legislative body for environmental policy and that a lot of environmental responsibilities are shifted from national to EU level. Despite the implementation of these European environmental regulations remaining at the national or regional levels, activists, officials and scholars are in agreement that environmental organisations have reoriented their strategies toward Brussels. And because they want to influence EU policy, they realise that those who are based in Brussels are more effective.

This does not mean that environmental mass movements' activities are starting to be organised at the European level; it occurs almost exclusively at the local, regional and national levels. The weight of national activism is much higher than all the talk about Europeanisation would hold. Rightly or wrongly, environmental groups and movements concentrate on national and local levels and target national and regional institutions and reference groups that sometimes are also relevant in the EU domain. The era of the nation state is far from over.

However, while it is true that the influence of the environmental movement at the EU level is limited by the big obstacles to organising transnational mass mobilisations, it is also true that mobilisations restricted to the national or even local level have the power to disrupt EC funded projects. Even organisations such as Greenpeace act at the European level in a more conventional manner, constrained to narrowly institutional action that conforms to the logic and structure of the EU institutions.

4.2. The Regional Sector – Cultural/Linguistic Minorities

4.2.1. Policy History and Significance

Within the EU15, generally in addition to the official language or languages of the state, it is estimated that as many as 40 million citizens living in 60 communities regularly use one of the 45 regional or minority languages that has been passed on from generation to generation (EBLUL:2003). After the latest EU enlargement bringing the EU member states up to 25, there exist around 90 minority language groups.

Hence, the issue of protection of minority languages may vary strongly between countries, and within countries between minorities. There is also little chance for conversion given the fact that Europeanisation through existing European charters and treaties and action plans⁴ is rather weak, given the relative absence of EU policy in this

⁴ The European Charter on Regional or Minority Languages of the Council of Europe; the Copenhagen criteria (the respect for and protection for minorities"); the draft Constitutional Treaty, mentions the principle of 'unity in diversity'. Article I.2 speaks now of the Union values includes a reference to minorities. Art. 6 evokes a 'society of pluralism, tolerance, justice, solidarity and non-discrimination' and Part 2 of the draft Treaty stresses the EU's respect for the 'diversity of the cultures and traditions of the people in Europe'. On 27 July 2003 the European Commission adopted the Action Plan for the promotion of language learning and linguistic diversity. It proposes a series of actions to be taken at European level in 2004 – 2006 with the aim of supporting actions taken by local, regional and national authorities. Respect for linguistic and cultural diversity is one of the cornerstones of the European Union, now enshrined in Article 22 of the European Charter of Fundamental Rights, which states "The Union respects cultural, religious and linguistic diversity." On the initiative of the European Parliament, which has adopted a series of resolutions on this subject, the European Union has taken action to safeguard and promote the regional and minority languages of Europe. The ADUM project received co-funding (2004-05) following a call for proposals in the context of the European Commission's Action Plan: Promoting Language Learning and Linguistic Diversity. ADUM aims to inform people and organisations

field. In fact, compared to the environmental and anti-racism sector, the European Union and other Europe-wide institutions remain rather irrelevant decision-makers or decision-arenas.

Given the relative isolation of minority groups within their state, their perception of the uniqueness of their minority situation and of the state and its official language as obstacle to minority language maintenance, the state level is less relevant as arena for mobilisation. Hence, while in the environmental and anti-racism sector have also focused on national SMOs/MACs and their links with and European Social Movement Organisations, in the case of the promotion of the defence of linguistic/cultural minorities we generally do not find national, or state-level umbrella organisations, but only umbrella movements situated at the level of the region/community of the linguistic minority group.

Therefore, the regional level is the main arena for mobilisation and conflict resolution. However, in some countries also the regional level is underdeveloped as a policy-making arena (such as in Sweden, Hungary and Poland). The linguistic sector also suffers from structural disadvantages for mobilisation in a multi-level Europe, due to communication barriers, small size of minorities, severe pressures for assimilation, and overlapping and accumulative disadvantages.

In several states the issue of minority language protection is directly linked to demands of minority nationalist movement for more self-government, sometimes including extreme demands for secession (De Winter & Türsan, 1998). National cohesion in many states is still menaced by cultural diversity (e.g. Belgium, Spain, Cyprus, UK). Thus, the state level is often viewed as hostile to demands of linguistic protection, perceived as threat to the "unity of the state" and the national model of democracy (e.g. France, Greece).

The relations between civil society and the state in the minority language sector are therefore different from those in the environmental and anti-racist sector. While in the latter two the state is to some extent a decision-making arena that regulates or arbitrates between demands from various sectors of civil society and the economy, in the case of linguistic minorities the state (and the official state language) is often the

working throughout Europe in support of the so-called "regional" or "minority" languages about the opportunities provided by the European programmes for the (co)funding of projects relating to these languages. The Language Policy Unit of the Directorate General for Education and Culture, report "Support for minority languages in Europe" commissioned a thoroughgoing analysis of the issues surrounding the protection and promotion of regional and minority languages in the EU context. Also the European Parliament issued a Report with recommendations to the Commission on European regional and lesser-used languages – the languages of minorities in the EU – in the context of enlargement and cultural diversity.

“adversary” in the issue conflict. Hence, the state, the main opponent of civil society in this sector, is a formidable veto player, a legitimate and forceful actor from the lowest level (local, region) to the European level. Also, civil society in this sector is often presented in a holistic and organic manner (“the people”, the in-group) thus opposing the entire minority civil society against the state (controlled by the “others”, the out-group).

Yet, other states have gradually accepted and even cherished language diversity and view minority language protection as an essential part of their national format of democracy (Germany, Belgium).

The features of civil society organisations defending minority languages in Europe depend on a wide variety of factors.

First, there is the actual “health condition” of the minority language studied, which affects the size, activity, representativeness and claims of minority language SMOs:

- a) (Near-) extinction (“language death” or “language loss”), when a language is hardly ever used (only and rarely in “private” spheres like family and friends), when its number of speakers has shrunk and continues to decline, where the language can only be saved from extinction by active measures for reviving (codification or even re-inventing) the language, for instance by re-instructing it (Cornish);
- b) “Dying” languages (“language at risk” of “extinction” or “destruction”): when the small number of speakers declines regularly (often due to generational change); where the language can be saved by strong protective measures for reviving the use of the language, for instance by transmitting it to younger generations by compulsory teaching;
- c) Revitalisation: the “extinction process” has stopped but the language still needs strong protective measures, such as compulsory teaching to new generations and labour market privileges to native speakers, to guarantee its recovery (e.g. Welsh);
- d) “Language security” or “language consolidation”: the number of speakers in the minority territory is high and stable (German in the Belgian German-speaking Community), and only needs infrastructural resources to maintain this level (language maintenance); often consolidation is acquired by granting the status of co-official language with the minority territory, next to the state’s official language (for instance, German in the South Tyrol province);

- e) Officialisation and territorial hegemonisation: when a minority language becomes the sole or predominant official language on its territory, menacing the maintenance of other languages (including the official state language); the main outstanding challenges regard acquisition of the status as co-official language on equal footing with the state majority language, at state level as well as the European level, on equal footing with the state majority language (e.g. the Catalanisation of Catalonia).

The “health condition” of the minority language will determine not only the type of policies demanded from the centre, but also the place of the protection of minority language in the wider basket of demands made by SMOs and public actors defending a cultural minority. In the extreme cases (death or hegemony), language is often not the main issue any more (because the cause is definitely won or definitely lost). Thus, other minority demands, like devolution of cultural, social and economic competencies, may become more salient than pure linguistic demands.

A second determinant of features of civil society organisations defending minority languages is the degree of institutional recognition of minorities. This also varies extremely amongst the cases covered in this study, with some minorities having gained constitutional recognition (as a linguistic community, region, national minority), running their own autonomous institutions, endowed with large competencies including language use, and sometimes having large fiscal/financial resources. Others minorities’ rights are not constitutionally protected and are dealt with by special state institutions (parliamentary commission, government departments) while a third group is not institutionalised or the institutionalisation of minority rights protection is even officially undermined (such as the French-speaking people around Brussels and minorities in France (apart from Corsica).

To reiterate, the “language regime” under which minorities live is extremely varied ranging in status from being: a) the sole official language in region (Flemish in Flanders), menacing the survival of other languages spoken in the region; b) a co-official language in region with the state-wide official language (South-Tyrol); c) a recognised minority language where state policy gives protection to its users and aims at maintenance or recovery of the language (Sámi); d) a language that is not officially recognised but tolerated by state authorities (Frisian before 1993); e) a language which use is discouraged by official state policy (French in Brussels’ Flemish periphery); and f) a language which use is discouraged or persecuted by official state policy (Walachian in Greece).

In some countries, minority language questions are not affected by other cleavages and they are “pure” linguistic in nature, while in others there are intertwined (for instance the religious one concerning the Turkish-speakers in Thrace which are also Muslim), or even overshadowed by other cleavages (such as the Roma in Hungary who are in the first place disfavoured in social/economic/educational terms, and for whom concerns of keeping linguistic identity are secondary).

To conclude, different starting positions regarding the health of the minority language, different politics of language accommodation, different experiences with regimes (authoritarian principle of ruling and phases of democratisation, timing of suffrage enlargement), different regime structures and competent policy levels (e.g. federal vs. unitary states), different degrees and timing of politicisation/representation of the centre-periphery cleavage, different links with self-government demand movements and autonomist parties, unique path dependencies, historic policy traumas and/or collective guilt, claims for the uniqueness of the minority culture, turns this issue sector into one where more than in the other policy sectors in CIVGOV, we find strong arguments for “exceptionalism” and “incommensurability”, claiming that each case is too unique to be compared with any other case. This seriously jeopardises collective action of civil society at the state and EU-level.

4.2.2. Nature and Structure of MACs

Sub-national and national level

There is quite a variety in the organisational density and integration of civil society. One would expect that the sub-state territory on which the minority lives (here called the “region”) would serve as the main level for mobilisation and action in this sector. In fact, in several cases, minorities have established an umbrella or peak organisation for cultural defence representing the linguistic/cultural interests of the entire community. Sometimes there is a single peak organisation (the Sorbian Domowina), in other cases there are several (Diwan and Ti ar Vro in Brittany). In some cases, these multiple peak organisations are genuine competitors, in others they are complementary, each focusing on one aspect of cultural protection (language teaching, fine arts).

Finally, in some cases the main organisations are situated at the local level, with weak supra-local overarching organisations (Hungarian Roma). This regional absence is sometimes less problematic because devolution has provided for regional public services, consultation bodies, institutionalised discussion arenas, etc., where local and specialised SMOs can “plug into” (e.g. the case of the German-speakers in Belgium). In other cases,

the absence of regional peak organisations reveals the weakness of civil society or even an oppressive opportunity structure (like the French-speaking in the Brussels' periphery).

In large umbrella organisations, leadership seems to be mainly delegative-democratic, with full-time leaders (board) being democratically elected/appointed and held accountable through a (at least yearly) general assembly composed of member organisations, who themselves mostly run on a voluntary basis. These meetings also offer the assembly members the opportunity of co-deciding on main goals and strategies. The larger umbrella organisations have become "professionally" run and bureaucratic organisations, i.e. with paid leaders and staff, in addition to the help of voluntary member organisations/activists. In communities that do not have regional peak organisations, leadership in these smaller (sub-regional) organisations seems to be more often personalistic or even inherited, and based on the leader's personal capacities to represent the interests of the (local) community at a higher level acting as brokers between the sub-region and the regional/state bureaucracies.

In most cases where minority political parties are relevant as umbrella parties (for instance the SVP, CDC, PNV, SNP), leadership follows formally the mass party model whereby members/local party delegates elect the leaders. The larger minority parties have become "professional" organisations, i.e. with paid leaders and staff, in addition to the help of voluntary activists.

EU level

While regionalist associations in Brussels hold a relatively privileged position when it comes to accessing and interacting with the European institutions, this is not the case for EMOs specifically defending minority languages. From among the key regionalist associations⁵ that are formally recognised by the European Institutions⁶ very few hold the defence of minority languages as their main policy objective. In fact, only the European Bureau of Lesser Used Languages (EBLUL) has a permanent office in Brussels.⁷

⁵ The Assembly of European Regions (AER), the Association of European Border Regions (AEBR), the Conference of Peripheral and Maritime Regions (CPMR), the Conference of the European Regional Legislative Assemblies (CALRE), the Council of European Municipalities and Regions (CEMR), Eurocities and the Conference of European Regions with Legislative Power (REGLEG).

⁶ The European Commission, European Parliament and the Committee of the Regions (CoR) all have different means of ensuring close working with these associations. The CoR tends to be considered by the other two institutions as the institution that is best placed to identify which regional associations they should deal with and has a co-operation agreement with the seven main organisations.

⁷ Other organisations that deal with cultural regionalism are Eurominority (based in Brittany), "Les Rencontres"-Association of European Cities and Regions for Culture (based in Paris), the Federal Union of European Nationalities (FUEN) and the European Centre for Minority Issues (ECMI) (both based in Flensburg).

The Commission provides funding to EBLUL and supports projects which are aimed at the protection and promotion of minority languages.⁸

4.2.3. Issues and campaigns

The campaigns to protect and promote minority languages are related to the state of health of the language. In very small language communities, serious efforts have still to be invested to standardise the language (Ladin), or agree over concrete proposals for standardisation (LSU as the official Sard). Some movements still have to invest to get an official recognition as a minority (e.g. the French-speaking in Flanders), others focus on implementing a recently acquired formal protection as minority language status, while for some language maintenance is taken for granted or has to be aided to get consolidated as a hegemonic language (Catalan). Some others focus on the legal, constitutional or even EU recognition of the status of their minority language (Danes and Frisian in Germany) calling for the application of the European Charter on Regional or Minority Languages, or even requesting that their minority language be recognised as an official EU language (Catalan, Welsh).

In nearly all the cases, learning the minority language at school is considered to be a main challenge and necessity, and the domain *par excellence* to work at the maintenance of the language. Another common sphere of promotion of the minority language is the economic sector, which seems to be slow in adapting to the expansion of the minority language into a hegemonic language.

The use of campaigns depends also on the accessibility of the political system. The Sami seem to 'campaign' very little, which may be partly due to the easy access they have to specialised corporatist bodies for Sami interests. The Roma in Hungary do not use much of campaigns, apart from cultural programs to strengthen identity, to facilitate mobilisation and build bridges to non-Roma. Sometimes, low levels of campaigning are explained by the lack of consensus between different components of the minority group, their strict adherence to a neutral, non-partisan or non-ideological profile, or the necessity of consensus-building and solidarity to make the voice of the minority heard 'higher up' (Germany). In cases with low campaign activity, one finds an emphasis on the use of cultural festivals, happenings, etc. for fostering identity and making the minority visible to the outside world. In some cases, there is no campaigning for the promotion of the minority language, either because the minority language is alive and kicking (German-

⁸ Following article 22 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union⁸, which guarantees the respect for linguistic and cultural diversity.

speakers in Belgium), or nearly dead (Cornish). In strong cases where the minority language has become the hegemonic language, campaigns are directed to further strengthen this hegemony, for instance by teaching the minority language to immigrants, or eradicating pockets of bilingualism (for instance in advertising).

In cases where language promotion has become less relevant, campaigns are often directed towards further expansion of the regional autonomy status and its institutions (regional assembly), as well as the devolution of socio-economic powers of "the centre" to the region.

4.2.4. Public opinion

We find a strong variation of state-wide public opinion on minority language protection, ranging from strongly supportive (Sweden) to unawareness and indifference (Germany). In most countries, minority groups complain about lack of awareness of the larger public, and indifferent or even negative attitudes and prejudices. Often the positive image is dependent on the small size of the community (as it can never become a menace towards the majority) and the state's activist policies to improve the image of minorities and the minority parties' capacity to pick up new issues that traditional parties tend to neglect (like the Danish SSW). Some minorities try to improve their image and that of minorities by presenting themselves as exemplary citizens, who speak several languages, are not focused on a single culture and nation-state, are new multicultural European citizens (like the Danish in Germany) as opposed to the majority of mono-cultural, old fashioned nation-statist "nationals".

In some cases the minority group finds that the protection of their language is not an issue any more, because it is institutionally well protected and widely used hegemonic (e.g. Catalonia). Similar positive attitudes are found in regions where the minority language is spoken widely by the locals. In fact, regions in which the local public support for minority language and groups is reported to be weak are generally those in which the regional language has a hard time surviving or needs to be resuscitated.

4.2.5. Strategies

Sub-national and national level

The strategies of SMOs in the linguistic sector strongly depend on the kind of organisation. When the main minority organisations are parties with a significant number of elected officials, most strategies are on the one hand institutional: participating in parliamentary debate, initiation of legislation, participation, co-decision making, etc., and on the other hand, the professional use of media. Less powerful parties try to lobby or

act as whiplash party vis-à-vis the state-wide parties present in their region. In some countries, specific minority consultation and co-decision bodies have been set up at the regional level (Germany, Corsica, Friuli and Sardegna), national level (Sweden, Hungary) and even at the local level (Hungary, Brussels), which evidently tend to focus political activism on institutionalised and consensus-seeking participation and co-decision making.

Most organisations participate in consultation structures, whenever they are available. The non-party organisations sometimes use election time as a moment to promote their cause vis-à-vis candidates of different parties. Surprisingly, most organisations use very rarely strong direct action methods. Usually protest actions are limited to organising meetings or collecting a petition. The weakest groups tend to focus on creating awareness and sympathy for their minority language in the wider community (Italy and Greece). Appeal to European institutions is rare. Also appeal to the judiciary is rather uncommon.

The use of media is very varied: some movements call it a crucial strategy, while others shun it for fear that excessive call for media attention may back-fire into negative publicity.

EU level

EBLUL is often consulted by the Commission to provide an expert opinion on draft legislation regarding regional and minority languages because they have formal consultative status with them. However, they are not asked for opinions on policies on 'languages' in general. While access to the DG Education and Culture is considered easy, there is strong doubt about the effectiveness of these contacts. EBLUL would like to see themselves involved in every stage of the policy making process and especially at the earliest stage. Regarding the Parliament, EBLUL have smooth access, especially through a handful of sympathetic MEPs, who come from regionalist and minority parties, and are lobbied directly. Access to the Council only works when backed by a strong political force (involving national ministers).

4.2.6. Openness/responsiveness of political opportunity structure and level of institutional contact for SMOs

Sub-national and national level

The regional level is generally reported as the most open one, with a few exceptions. Also the local level generally gets positive appreciation, but is less widely mentioned than the regional level.

The national level only gets genuine positive appreciations in Germany (a “success story”) but outspoken negative evaluations in France, Greece and Spain (and to some extent Sweden).

EU level

Europe is mentioned rarely by regional SMOs. If it is mentioned references are nearly always positive. While considered generally irrelevant, in about half of the cases the EU is still perceived to be more open than the national government, while the regional level is perceived to be somewhat more responsive. However, there exists a general discontent about the problems of access to the EU for most of the regional SMOs, which perceive themselves as too small, poor, understaffed, uninformed and inexperienced to interact effectively with the European Commission.

4.2.7. Degree of common understanding among SMOs/MACs and with institutional and other relevant actors

The strongest common understanding, although often only qualified as “moderate”, is found at the regional level, between linguistic SMOs, other classical civil society movements, and the minority sector (nationalist) in particular. European allies (umbrella organisations and other regional movements) are often mentioned as well. Some report highly or moderately competitive and divisive linguistic SMO sectors (like the Roma).

The main actors perceived to be holding a different understanding usually include national (political) decision-makers, among which left-wing parties and trade unions are mentioned more often (except for Italy, Spain and Poland where the “opposition” seems to come more from the right-wing).

4.2.8. Relevance of EU policy-making

There is a wide consensus that the EU is a significant positive new element in the political opportunity structure of minority language SMOs. Some embrace it as almost their last hope (French-speakers in the Brussels periphery), a few take a positive but critical stance, while some are discontent that - while being generally positive - Europe still remains a distant arena for them.

For many minority nationalist movements and parties, the link with European integration has allowed them to modernise their demand and give it a positive reference (against old-fashioned state-wide nationalism) as “exemplary Europeans that appreciate the values of differences and tolerance in a multicultural Europe”, and get rid of the all too common negative images of folklore, backwardness, traditionalism and even right-

wingism. It helped to overcome generational conflicts between the old “nationalist” defenders of the minority language and younger generations seeking new legitimization of the defence of minority language protection in post-nationalist and post-statist multicultural Europeanism.

For many SMOs, European integration offers additional meeting points, arenas, opportunities for coordination, networking and mutual learning. Europe has expanded their capacity of venue shopping, shifting mobilisation and lobbying between the local, regional, national and European level.

The Charter on Regional or Minority Languages of the Council of Europe receives most positive references as source of European support for the minority language cause. In several states, the Charter has become the standard of good practice and is even involved in the evaluation of the Charter’s implementation process (UK). EBLUL is also mentioned in a few cases, while the Federal Union of European Nationalities is basically only referred to by German minorities. Finally, some SMOs have tried to lobby to include the protection of linguistic minorities in the Draft Constitution of the EU.

EU cohesion policy toward sub-regions containing a minority language sometimes fosters the population’s consciousness as a distinctive region (Cornwall in the “South-West” region). Interreg also offers advantages to interface regions with minorities that speak the language of the large bordering country in order to establish closer relations with their linguistic counterparts (DGB).

The recent enlargement of the EU including very small nation-states with a hegemonic but ‘lesser used’ language (Malta, the Baltic states) is seen as an opportunity for many nations without a state. In fact, there is the growing contradiction between the absence of institutional recognition of large regions, such as Catalonia, Scotland, Flanders, etc. and the full recognition of these small nation-states. Minority nationalist parties argue that if the only guarantee for political existence at the European level is ‘stateness’, the only possibility given to stateless nations to be recognised at the European level will be to become an independent state in the framework of the European Union. Hence, in order to avoid such ‘independentist’ strategies, the EU and its member states are expected to institutionally better incorporate the regions in the EU constitutional framework.

The same contradiction exists regarding the full recognition of the languages of the small new member states and the refusal to recognise the official language of large regions spoken by millions of EU-citizens (e.g. Catalan). The new small nation-states are expected to be more sensitive to questions of the survival of cultural small communities, for instance regarding the use of minority languages as official EU-language and EU-

policies regarding liberalising the cultural communication markets. Also here the EU is expected to move towards recognition.

Finally, the newest EU member countries have been pushed to adopt measures regarding minority protection as part of the practice and rhetoric of the *acquis communautaire*. As for the EU15 member states they were considered to respect their minorities by default, while they often did not (e.g. France, Greece, and to some extent Belgium). Hence, contestation of minority rights in the enlargement countries may carry unintended long-term effects in the accession countries, i.e. feedback of external minority policies into the internal EU system. In several states, the Charter on the protection of minority rights has become the standard of good practice and has even involved the Council of Europe in the evaluation of the Charter's implementation process (UK). In the long run, some EU15 countries may be pushed to implement the minority protection conditions they have imposed on the most recent member countries.

In spite of these positive EU-attitudes and high hopes for the future, there is a widespread consensus that the EU is currently irrelevant for the protection of minority languages, apart from its financial support to EBLUL and some general language and other programmes that indirectly may also be beneficial to minority languages. The EU is perceived as over cautious in tackling the question of national minorities given the resistance of some strong nation-states (France, Greece) and therefore only focuses on official language policy.

4.2.9. Alliances and networks at EU level

EBLUL is clearly the most relevant European level SMO, although considered totally irrelevant in some countries (Belgium and Hungary). While generally evaluated positively in terms of representativeness, access to the EU, dissemination of information, networking and learning opportunities, sensitisation of public opinion and legitimisation of minority demands, some criticise its focus on language rather than on minorities and that large minorities predominate its internal decision-making process.

The other European SMO sometimes mentioned is the FUEN, considered to be more politically engaged in promoting minority rights, but with little support from the EU. In a few countries other European SMOs are sometimes mentioned (Germany, Sweden), while several regional SMOs entertain good contacts with similar organisations in regions in other states. Generally, the relations between SMOs in the same country are considered to be good, if present. In several countries one finds region or state specific umbrella organisations (France, Italy, Poland, Spain, Sweden).

4.2.10. General comments on degree of Europeanisation of policy-sector and civil society organisation in sector

The degree of success of the struggle of SMOs for the recognition, protection and expansion of their minority language depends on the interaction of a wide variety of factors: the size of the minority population, the health of the minority language, the unity of the SMO sector (territorially, ideologically, ethnically) and the capacity to speak with one voice in spite of heterogeneity, their internal resources, their capacity for state-wide and European networking and alliances, the institutional and cultural receptiveness and openness of their state wide (and regional) political system (corporatist culture, consultation and co-decision structures), their actual inclusion/exclusion in corporatist institutions, the accumulation of discrimination (socio-economic backwardness, e.g. Roma, Sorbian), the activist policies of a neighbouring protector state (or region), the existence, numeric strength and pivotal/governmental power of a minority party, the solution of the problem of generational renewal in terms of organisation and language speakers, the degree of institutionalisation of SMOs (facilitating the introduction of rules, procedures and traditions, and better access to government bodies, etc.).

4.3. The Regional Sector – Structural Policy

4.3.1. Introduction

It has been clear from the beginning that this policy sector – Structural Regionalism, as we ended up calling it for sake of brevity, but more precisely European Regional Development Policy (ERDP) or Structural policy or, again, Cohesion policy – was somewhat 'special.' Two features, in particular, set ERDP aside from the other policy areas included in this project.

The first is that regional authorities (functionaries and politicians) often play a dual role – that of the policy advocates and that of the policy-makers – and stand on both sides, the demand and the supply side, of the policy equation. In their capacity as policy advocates, they both complement and replace MACs, which in the other policy areas may exclusively or predominantly be composed of civil society activists. Civil society organisations also play a dual role, partaking both in the drafting and in the implementation of the regional development programs. The second distinguishing trait of this policy area is that the civil society organisations which play a role in the advocacy as well as in the implementation of European structural policies are often organised interests (trade unions, business/professional associations, etc.) or private-public organisations (Chambers of Commerce, technological hubs, etc.) and more rarely genuine social movement organisations (consumers' associations, organised concerned citizens, cultural

associations, etc.). Moreover, the role of civil society organisations is somewhat less central in this than in the other policy areas precisely because in part their role is taken up by the regional authorities themselves. In their capacity as civil society advocates, regional and local authorities act through umbrella organisations – EMACs, as we called them – which lobby European institutions in Brussels and elsewhere (by staging media-covered events) in Europe. Finally, individual regional or local authorities and businessmen may also seek to exert pressure through individual lobbying and personal relations.

We acknowledged also other problems with this policy area, which we however tried to resolve from the start. One problem had to do with the difficulty of identifying precisely what constitutes a regional development issue. Sometimes, for example, regional development projects or decisions are contested by environmental groups mobilising against the impact of given development projects, thus rendering this instance of civil society mobilisation difficult to classify: would it be a case of structural regionalism or rather of environmentalism? Conversely, sometimes decisions on development projects which have a deep impact on the regional economy are taken at the central level and do not imply the involvement of regional authorities or of regional civil societies: should these be treated as instances of regional or of national structural policy? To sort out what constitutes an instance of regional development, we decided to take a rather restrictive definition of regionalism: 'regional development issues' were all those issues which saw the law-mandated or practice-sanctioned involvement of regional authorities and civil society interests in the decision-making process.

Because civil society organisations did not spontaneously pop up to make themselves heard in regional development issues, we had to establish a rule for uncovering them. We decided that the groups formally involved in Structural Funds' Monitoring Committees would be our primary target and that all other groups which the 'insider knowledge' of the country research teams also considered relevant would also be targeted. We sometimes ended up with a mixed bag of interviews, representing civil society organisations of different nature, at different level of territorial involvement and with different degrees of representativeness, behaviour, influence, etc. In part, this was unavoidable because the countries included in our sample were very different both in terms of the territorial structure of the state and in terms and the traditions of civil society involvement in policy-making.

These problems notwithstanding, we believe we have assembled an impressive set of data from questionnaires, documents and interviews which give us a rather precise picture of the degree and manner of civil society involvement in ERDP. This, we believe,

is an important contribution to the ongoing debate on European governance and the need to bridge the gap between citizens and institutions in the European Union. It would appear that, in structural policy, this gap still exists (and is bound to exist also in the future) if it is assumed that the bridging function should be borne solely by civil society organisations. In reality, we discovered that a much more powerful linkage mechanism already exists: regional representative governments and their bureaucracies. This is obviously not a novelty: upon this claim were based many requests that the regions lodged vis-à-vis their national states and the European Union since the seventies. As a vast literature has documented (Keating 1988, 1996, 1998; Goldsmith/Klausen 1997; Hopkins 1995; Bache 1998; Bullman 1994; Hooghe 1996; Heinelt/Smith 1996; Jeffery 1997; Jones/Keating 1995; Keating/Loughlin 1997; le Galès/Lequesne 1997; Leonardi 1993; Bukowski/Piattoni/Smyrl 2003 – to list only a few volumes on the subject), regions have sought to re-establish their role as conveyors of fundamental identities and interests, both at the national and at the European level, by requesting formal involvement in decision-making processes that touch on regional and local issues, by calling for the creation of institutions for the representation of region and local interests, by creating umbrella organisations to lobby the national and the supranational level, etc. However, what emerged from this research which had not been documented before is that the civil advocate role played by regional governments is openly acknowledged also by civil society organisations.

The picture is still mixed, though, as some regional governments are too encumbered by their historic traditions, their bureaucratic roles, their formal representative mandate, their limited legal powers, and their internal political divisions to act as powerful linkages between local societies and European institutions. Their participation in European governance is therefore still somewhat underplayed. Multi-level governance (MLG) – the codeword for the structured and spontaneous participation in public decision-making of public authorities with different territorial jurisdictions and of private collective actors representative of civil society – is still, at best, patchy.⁹

In the realm of structural policy, where MLG should show its full potential, actual involvement of both regional/local tiers and of civil society organisations is still insufficient particularly in the ascending phase of the policy – from the redefinition of the Regulations governing programming periods to the elaboration of the Community Support Frameworks (CSFs) and SPDs – but also in the descending phase – implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of the Regional Operative Programmes

⁹ The literature on multi-level governance (MLG) is vast. See, among others, Hooghe and Marks (2001), Bache and Flinders (2004), Christiansen and Piattoni (2004).

(ROPs). It is still true that both regional authorities and civil society representatives are involved in the policy-making process only insofar as the national government allow them. It remains equally true that regional authorities and civil society organisations can seek redress to this situation through the many channels that link - directly (cf. the analysis contained in Work Package 4) and indirectly (cf. the analysis contained in Work Package 3) - the local societies with European institutions, yet their effort and success remains uneven.

Two problems emerged as particularly relevant. First, there often exists a mismatch between the level at which civil society organisations are most active (often the local/city level and the national level) and the level at which they can make an input into structural policy (the regional level). Moreover, these organisations rarely mobilise around developmental problems per se, but around specific issues related with economic development (such as environmental, social marginality, ethnic identity, etc.). They are thus unable to make a contribution to structural policy decision-making due to lack of knowledge, personnel, reach or, simply, interest. The second problem has to do with the way in which political opportunities for MLG are structured. The most relevant phases for airing concerns about development is either the programming phase (the drafting of the CSFs or SPDs) or the implementation phase, and in this latter case the relevant arenas are the Monitoring Committees. Yet, at both stages the actual involvement of civil society organisations is very limited, while that of regional and local authorities is more substantial. In several national contexts, sometimes unexpectedly, formal involvement counts for very little while informal contacts are more effective. The procedures for the involvement of the regional and local tiers and civil society organisations are, thus, mostly a façade which hides a reality of detachment, marginality, even alienation. The following sections will document these bitter-sweet conclusions.

Nature of Public Opinion

Structural policy does not elicit much public interest and most people are ignorant of what it is and what it does for them. This holds also for countries, such as Sweden, in which public decision-making is rather transparent and in which people are rather well informed. Opinions are confused and somewhat contradictory. Unfortunately, regional development is not one of those issues which are regularly monitored by Europe-wide polls such as Eurobarometer. The only Eurobarometer Survey which is relevant to our purposes was produced in 1995 (*The Regions – Eurobarometer 43.1bis*) and showed the following data:

- 1) most people in Europe are ignorant of the existence of the Structural Funds (only 18% of people know of its existence in Italy, 18% in France, 22% in the Netherlands, 23% in Sweden); awareness is higher in Cohesion countries (ranging from 54% in Portugal to 23% in Greece);
- 2) people strongly believe that regions should be involved in EU matters, particularly in southern Europe (89% in Portugal, 87% in Spain, 85% in France and 81% in Italy), but at the same time they are unaware of the Committee of the Regions, while wanting to devolve more powers to it;
- 3) 50% of the people believe that structural policy should continue also after enlargement, but with stricter criteria; 27% believe that nothing should change; 7% is opposed to the idea of extending structural policy to enlargement countries.

Significance of policy sector and political opportunity structure

The main differences in the significance of structural policy across countries are due to:

- 1) the amount of funds received and their visibility;
- 2) the institutional structure of the state, whether federal, regional or unitary;
- 3) the divisiveness of structural issues in the country;
- 4) whether a national regional development policy existed prior to the 1988 reform of the Structural Funds.

At one extreme, unitary states with a long tradition of central involvement in (regional) development policy, yet in which economic disparities are low should present the worst POS of all: the existence of a tradition of national involvement in regional development creates "learning" problems to central and regional authorities alike and discouraged the involvement of SMOs in this policy field. At the other extreme, federal states with a long tradition of regional involvement in development policy and in which regional imbalances have been traditionally strong should present the best POS of all. Paradoxically, though, this factor – existence of long traditions of regional development policies either at the central or at the decentralised level – militates against the involvement of civil society organisations in all types of states: in unitary states (the UK), in regionalised states (Italy and France) and in federal states (Germany).

4.3.2. Nature and Structure of MACs

The SMOs active in structural regionalism may be of different types. They range from purely civil society organisations (such as farmers' or seamen's associations) to private-public organisations (such as Chambers of Commerce and other organisations for the promotion of regional development). The quasi-public nature of many SMOs active in structural regionalism is due to two reasons. First, they are often rather old organisations, which have adopted the same institutional format as the levels of government they interact with most frequently (in a sort of "institutional osmosis"). Second, in unitary or centralised states, pure civil society activism is rare, particularly in mature, material policy areas such as structural regionalism. We therefore expected to find a relatively higher frequency of quasi-public organisations in unitary, centralised states like Poland and Greece and in states with a long regional development policy tradition such as France and Italy. Then we expected to find a greater presence of truly civil society organisations in countries with a longer tradition of local self-government and with a liberal approach to economic development such as the UK. Finally, in countries with a neo-corporatist tradition we expected to find a higher presence of those civil society organisations such as trade unions and employers' associations which, while firmly grounded in civil society, had to develop a *modus operandi* close to that of public offices as a consequence of their frequent interactions with ministerial and departmental officials. These expectations were only partially met. Understandably, the internal structure of these SMOs changes according to their "purely private", "mixed public-private" or "quasi-public" nature. The nature of their leadership, the types of contacts to membership, and the ways of keeping in touch with the rank-and-file change accordingly.

At one end of the spectrum – for reasons related both to the recent adoption of regional development policy and to the highly unitary tradition of the state – is Hungary, where we would expect to find lowly institutionalised regional structures and a relative prevalence of purely private civil society organisations. In Hungary, not only is structural policy at the regional level a very recent phenomenon, but the very actors involved have been only recently created. Statistical regions for purely developmental planning purposes were created in Hungary only in 1996 (by the Law XXI on Regional Development and Territorial Organisation). This law created Development Councils and Development Agencies at the national, regional and county levels. Hungary, originally made up of counties, was divided for developmental purposes into regions – Central Hungary, West-Transdanubia, South Transdanubia, North Hungary, North Great Plain, South Great Plain – each made up of a number of counties. The 1996 law was later amended in 1999 (by Act XCII): regions became compulsory planning units with own Regional Development Councils and limited resources. They had to interact with lower

levels of government (the counties) and with higher levels of government (central ministries) as well as with employers and workers' associations. Despite this effort at creating a new institutional (regional) tier, the instruments for development devised by the EU were handled centrally: SAPARD (Special Accession Programme for Agricultural and Rural Development) which prepared to EAGGF, ISPA (Instrument Structurel de Pré-Accession) which prepared to the Cohesion Fund, and PHARE (Pologne, Hongrie Aide à la Reconstruction Économique) which prepared to ERDF were all handled from the centre. Also the National Development Plan for Hungary and the Operative Plans treat Hungary as one nation. Therefore, the regional dimension has remained underdeveloped, even if the current government claims that it wants to endow regional with self-governing powers. Representatives of civil organisations, heads and collaborators of development agencies and other experts were interviewed for this study. The civil society actors who have been involved in structural regionalism were selected from within a programme – the Institutionalisation of Civil Participation in Regional Development – established and financed by the MATRA fund of the Dutch government and the PHARE programme.

Probably because of the underdevelopment of the regional tier of government, regional civil society seems to be rather active in Hungary (the conditional is in order as many have the impression that these associations are direct spin-offs from larger international organisations with still insufficient grounding in Hungary). The *Független Ökológiai Központ* organisation (FÖK, Independent Ecological Centre) is mainly an organisation of professionals and different kinds of intellectuals aware of environmental issues. Another Hungarian SMO which participated in the elaboration of the National Development Plan and in the development plan of the Central Hungary Region is *Levegő Munkacsoport*. A third SMO is the *Reflex Environmental Association*, founded in 1987. Many of its founders were functionaries for the official environmental bodies (Directorate of Environment and Water Management). A significant ratio of its members consists of other organisations. Another SMO is *CSEMETE* (Kiss Ferenc Csongrád Megyei Természetvédelmi Egyesület - Kiss Ferenc Csongrád County Association for the Protection of Nature) which was established in 1987 in order to promote environment-conscious behaviours and attitudes among children, to reveal the environmental values of the Southern Great Plain region and act in order to protect these values, to call attention on environmental problems and dangers in the region. A fifth SMO is the *Ecological Institute for Sustainable Development (EISD)*, which was founded in 1992 by administrative members of local governments and private persons devoted to the protection of environment. The *GATE Zöld Klub (GATE Green Club)* was established in 1990 by university teachers and students of the University of Agricultural Sciences in Gödöllő. Its main aim is to preserve environment, to promote environmentalist values, environmental education. Its activists are mainly

university students who work voluntarily, without salary. The *Magyar Természetvédők Szövetsége* (*National Society of Conservationists*) or *MTVSZ* has roughly 90 members, most of which are local NGOs at the countryside, in some cases regional NGOs or citizens.

Also Poland and Greece fit into this category, and we would form our expectations consequently. However, country-specific features intervene to yield particular results. In Greece, more than elsewhere, civil society organisations do not get mobilised so much around economic development issues; rather, they get mobilised against the environmental or social repercussions of state-promoted development programs. As such, their actions end up spilling into other policy areas (such as the environmental or social cohesion policies).

At the other end of the spectrum we should expect to find Germany, with a long tradition of regional involvement in development issues and a consolidated federal structure. Here, the expectation is to find quasi-public organisations dominating the field of “civil society” mobilisation, and so it is. The consultation procedures which are so well-oiled in Germany are mostly of a classical tripartite type: employers’ associations, trade unions and the state are indeed used to sitting at the same (Bund- and Land-level) bargaining tables. Indeed, most social and environmental concerns are already taken up by the regional governments in drafting the regional programs, so that regional representatives – who have recently gained back some of the importance in EU decision-making that they had lost in the mid-eighties – are reluctant to leaving room for new civil society organisations. They feel they already represent civil society concerns such as sustainable development and equal opportunity between men and women, and that there is no need to add dubiously representative SMOs to the decision-making process.

In between, lie the regionalised member-states (Spain, Italy, France and, to a certain extent, even the UK) and those member states which, although unitary, have a long tradition of civil society involvement in public decision-making (Sweden). An intervening variable which proves of major importance is whether the region hosts an ethnic, linguistic or otherwise cultural minority of sorts, as this factor boosts civil society mobilisation also around developmental issues. In this sense, Belgium is a truly special case as its federal nature is directly due to the existence of linguistic “minorities” within the same state structure: this factor, combined with the extreme proximity to European institutions, allows civil society mobilisation to be both local and European at the same time.

It would appear that, in Spain, the nature of the SMOs involved in structural regionalism varies according to whether the minority language/nationalist issue is strong or weak. In Catalonia and the Basque Country, since the minority nationalist/language issue is so prominent, every other issue – including structural policy – gets sucked into it and tends to be assessed not on its own terms, but on whether it contributes or not to the nationalist cause. In these two regions, there appear to exist two policy networks. The first is composed of nationalist parties and movements: it mobilises against structural action when it allows the central state to meddle with these regions' internal affairs and contain these regions' autonomous powers, and sustains it when it allows the regional authorities to interact directly with Brussels bypassing the central government. The second is composed of functional groups and professional organisations, which are more open to multi-level interactions with both the central government and the Commission. In Galicia, instead, because the minority nationalist/language claims are weaker, only the second network – made of functional groups and professional organisations, which are generally in favour of structural action - exists. Nevertheless, here too, the region's nationalist party (BNG) criticises structural action as it allows the central PP party to maintain its clientelist networks and thus undercut the direct appeal of the BNG. A second element of differentiation between Catalonia and the Basque Country, on the one hand, and Galicia, on the other, is that while the Structural Funds in the first two regions is not very important, they are a major source of Galicia's structural investment. However, structural action has played an important role in the economic rebirth of all three regions. Among functional groups, the most relevant are workers' organisations, farmers associations and fishermen's unions. Among these latter, a further distinction must be drawn between the coastal fishing organisations, the *Cofradías* professional organisations of both managers and seamen, controlled by the government and with traditional practices, and the powerful deep sea fishing manager organisations, strongly interested in getting structural funds, and capable of lobbying in Brussels.

The interviews in Sweden were drawn from two Objective 1 regions, Norra Norrland and Södra Skogläregion. The social partners involved in the Monitoring Committees were of a mixed nature. Some represented the "usual" corporatist landscape of encompassing trade unions and employers associations (*Landsorganisationen* or LO, *Tjänstemännens Centralorganisation* or TCO, *Sveriges Akademiske Centralorganisation* or SACO, *Landbrukarnas Riksförbund* or LRF, *Folkrörelseradet* or Popular Movement Council for Rural Area Development), but some were political, cultural and social organisations involved in the protection of minority languages and the promotion of minority cultures and societies (*Sametinget*, *Svenska Samernas Riksförbund*, *Saminuorra*, *Gaaltje*,

Sveriges Finska Riksförbund, Stiftelsen Skansk Framtid).¹⁰ As we will see, the degree of involvement of these organisations in structural policy-making also crucially depends on the co-existence, within the region, of a sizeable and vocal ethnic/cultural minority.

In the UK, the principal actors for structural regionalism are the nationalist parties; the South West Regional Development Agency and the Government Offices for the Regions (for Cornwall, which is officially part of the South West Region), the Scottish Executive (for Scotland) and the Welsh Assembly government (for Wales), as institutional actors; and some occasional authentic SMO (such as Wales Environment Link, WEL, and the Welsh European Funding Office, WEFO). In this case, too, as in the case of Spain, regional development seems to be fully enmeshed with regional autonomy/independence issues. While parties are major actors in the claim for greater autonomy and the protection of minority languages (which often are the most evident national marker), their involvement in developmental issues is not as clear. An exception, in the past, was the RECHAR controversy which pitted the Scottish Nationalist Party against the Conservative Party then governing the country.¹¹ Since then, sovereignty and developmental issues have not been so tightly linked and the two issues have lived rather separate lives (or so it seems from the UK Report). The issue of legitimacy and representativeness is thus not really a problem, either because it is solved at the root (as in the case of the Scottish and Welsh representative assemblies) or because it is beyond the scope (as in the case of the regional governmental agencies).

Very different types of SMOs have been involved in SF implementation in the three regions of Italy. Some of the institutional actors had been or were at the time of the interview also expression of organised civil society: some Italian regions are truly Janus-faced, hosting within their own structures expressions of organised civil society. Among the authentic SMOs which were interviewed were: local branches of catholic workers' associations (such as the *Katholische Verband der Werktätiger, KVV*) with broader agendas than just the promotion of workers' rights (hence, cannot be considered as trade unions proper) but rather concerned with issues ranging from the promotion of

¹⁰ In all countries it was requested to select, as far as possible, the same regions, provinces or municipalities so as to minimise costs (information, travelling, contacts, etc.) and to gain a full picture of both structural development and minority languages and cultures problems. In Sweden, these areas overlap to a large extent, so the areas characterised by sparse and decreasing population and relative underdevelopment tend to coincide with the areas in which Sami, Finnish and Scanians tend to live.

¹¹ RECHAR was a financial Community Instrument created by the Commission to help the reconversion of coal mining areas. Designed particularly to help the Scottish economy in the late seventies, the Instrument could not be used because the UK government refused to produce evidence, as requested by the Commission, that the money thus received would indeed be used to that goal. The UK government considered unacceptable that part of its national budget might be dictated by European preferences and that the use of British money might have to be justified.

small-scale farming to the protection of working mothers, from the reform of pension schemes to solidarity across localities and across countries; the regional branches of the national catholic trade union (*UIL*); the regional branch of the left-wing national association of cooperatives (*Legacoop*), a form of enterprise in which the difference between employer and employee disappears as the workers are also the owners of the company; the regional branch of an international environmental association (the *World Wildlife Fund, WWF*); and one private-public association (the *Südtirol Marketing Gesellschaft, SMG*) which promotes a fairly narrow sectoral interest (tourism), but is located within the structure of the provincial government of the Province of Bolzano/Bozen. Most of these associations represent tens of thousands of members, although some have a much narrower membership. They all put a great emphasis on their representativeness, that is, on the number of members they intend to represent.

In France, it is still unclear to what extent the central government expects (and accepts) the spontaneous involvement of SMOs in structural policy-making. While the regional governments in Aquitaine, Corsica and Alsace have been hiring new personnel with the aim of arousing the interest and soliciting the participation of regional civil society actors (the so-called *animateurs du terrain*), partnership has been opened to local territorial structures (municipalities and their associations), professional unions, and various other associations such as the *Regional Chamber of Commerce and Industry (CRCI)* in Aquitaine and Corsica or public-private agencies such as the *Association pour le Développement des Entreprises et des Communication (ADEC)* in Alsace and UNITEC, a "technopole" and incubator of small enterprises in the city of Bordeaux, in Aquitaine.

4.3.3. Issues and Campaigns

Again, diversity is the code-word. Some regions are so new and still caught up in the definition of their identity and tasks that they are more involved in the campaigns concerning their institutional position and powers than in any of the substantive policies that they may be able to influence, among which structural policy. This is certainly the case of the Polish Voivodships, where civil society is engaged in the 'regional' (read 'devolution') battle. Other campaigns concern the 'revival of the Silesian countryside' and the 'development of the communal and rural districts.' In Hungary, civil society actors are involved in the ideational phase of structural policy, that is, the elaboration of development plans and operating programmes.

In Spain, in Catalonia and the Basque Country, structural issues seem to pop up only in connection with wider issues of European integration, in particular when the direct contacts between regions and Brussels are at stake. It thus takes a subsidiary and

instrumental character to issues of regional autonomy, at least according to the Spanish report. In Galicia, instead, the issue lives a life of its own and tends to resurface when the financial envelope or the reform of Structural Funds' regulations are being discussed. In the UK, the SMOs and institutional actors involved in structural regionalism seek to educate the public to issues having to do with the long-term impact of developmental projects and to poll families to discover where they think their regional economies should be going. Their main objective is therefore sensitisation and their main strategy is diffusion or information and, broadly speaking, education.

In Italy, the issues that SMOs have been recently involved in vary greatly according to their nature. The environmental association had recently promoted an action trying to stop or reduce the exploitation of the coastline near Trieste. The catholic workers' associations had been involved in the pension system reform issue; otherwise it periodically (around Easter time) carries out activities in favour of the disadvantaged. The trade unions had been recently agitating for an increase in employment rates. The cooperative movement had tried to stop national cuts to regional subsidies to cooperatives. All associations have first and foremost tried to mobilise their membership, but they have also tried to influence public opinion through the media or by staging direct action (strikes, manifestations, etc.).

4.3.4. Public opinion identification with SMOs/MACs

There is agreement among SMOs and institutional actors alike that, in structural regional matters, public institutions, particularly if elective, are the more genuine representatives of the general interest of the regional citizenry. SMOs and MACs admit to represent only very specific, although important, issues and to be special-purpose organisations. Neither do they claim to represent large sections of the populace (but rather ideas and values which are spread in the population to an unknown degree) nor do they really attempt to explain, educate and "raise the consciousness" of the population on structural issues (some exceptions can be noted in Hungary, France). At most they keep their membership informed and they try to represent their functional, sectoral or issue-specific values/ideas/interests. People are not very interested in structural policy and SMOs are not very interested in mobilising them.

4.3.5. Strategies of SMOs/MACs

From the varied picture of organisation across the countries studied, the following observations can be made as regards their strategies:

- 1) *informal, personal relations* are very often used sometimes instead of sometimes next to more official actions;
- 2) *mass rallies and disruption of public life* are used sparingly only to draw the authorities attention to critical matters (e.g., the Association of Mining Communes in Poland staged a mass demonstration or the Sami mobilised in unconventional ways to draw attention to the Sami situation);
- 3) *educational and sensitisation campaigns* are also rare, but do take place particularly through the media and political parties;
- 4) *petitions and judicial actions* are sometimes used with mixed effects;
- 5) *lobbying* is more used, particularly during electoral campaigns or at crucial reform points;
- 6) *lending of expert advice* occurs seldom, mostly because it is very difficult for SMOs to have experts on structural policy who can competently express their views on very technical matters, although it is considered as the potentially most fruitful way of being heard;
- 7) *participation in formal decision-making* is used by all whenever possible and meaningful; the problem is that it is often not particularly meaningful;
- 8) connection with similar associations at the European level is sometimes pursued with great zeal.

4.3.6. Openness/responsiveness of political opportunity structure and level of institutional contact for SMOs/MACs

As already remarked, the political opportunity structure (POS) is determined by a number of factors:

- 1) the institutional structure of the state (whether federal, regional or unitary);

- 2) the domestic tradition in state-society concertation (although sometimes with surprisingly opposite effects), which sometimes may even vary from region to region;
- 3) the particular rules which govern partnership in Monitoring Committees – rules about who should participate, whether or not they can vote, how votes should be cast, how early/late documents are shared, whether the opinions of SMOs must or must not be taken into account, how they should be produced, etc.;
- 4) the particular political philosophy regarding who is the rightful representative of civil society – whether SMOs or institutional actors – and where the initiative should come from – whether from the bottom or from the top;
- 5) the ideological leanings of the parties currently in government at the national and the regional level.

In Poland, feelings about the openness of the system are mixed. If “openness of the system” means “willingness to adapt to European regulations”, then, the Polish central system is considered rather open. But if “openness” means availability to accept the opinion and the contribution of the SMOs, then the system appears rather closed. Basically, these organisations are invited into the formal decision-making system, as per EU regulations, but their advice and expertise is not considered very much. The openness of the political system to SMOs in Hungary is still limited to expressing their opinion on already drafted development plans. Their continuous involvement in monitoring committees is rare. Their legitimacy is seen as limited, even though the legitimacy of regional councils and agencies is also limited in the absence of self-governing regional bodies. In Greece, even if they tried to use the Monitoring Committees to promote their (cultural and social) equal opportunity goals, civil society organisations would be granted very little recognition and formal space.

The national POS in Spain is generally closed to claims for greater autonomy, also when they are pressed in connection with structural issues. The regional POS is rather favourable in all regions, but its relative degree of openness depends on whether the local nationalist parties are in government or side with the opposition: questions of political expediency and alliance have priority over questions of development (apparently). However, the farmer’s association EHNE in the Basque Country, which was involved in the drafting of the Structural Funds, lamented that its involvement had been perfunctory, that the process was in reality rather closed, and that action through the media, petitions and direct mobilisation was more successful. The EU and the regional and local levels were characteristically more open than the national one to participation.

In Italy, opinions about the openness and the responsiveness of the political system are varied, ranging from relative disillusionment to high appreciation. Apparently, strong regional governments, which have the direct endorsement of the electorate, make institutional actors rather careless of the requests stemming from organised civil society. Governmental officials seem to think that they represent better (more directly and more fully) the populace than SMOs, therefore are tempted to ignore their input. On the contrary, weak (technical) governments seek the input of organised civil society as a way of filling the distance with the citizenry, thus giving SMOs greater attention. Also, right-wing governments seem more prone to using traditional "command and control" government techniques, while left-wing governments seem to have a greater appreciation for consultation and concertation.

The German POS is formally rather open, but organisationally rather hostile. Adversarial formal strategies on the part of German SMOs are, however, out of question. For example, the attempt to outvote the regional representatives (who have half of the votes in the Monitoring Committees and must vote in block) would require assembling such a large and composite coalition of sub-regional, functional and single-issues organisations that it would be practically impossible. What civil society organisations can do is mostly to recommend (lobby) that environmental and equal opportunity concerns, which should be already considered in the developmental programs, be indeed pursued. At the Monitoring Committees, any recommendation must be forthcoming as a written statement, because oral remarks can be ignored. This adds to the burdens of these organisations and to their feeling of frustration. For all these reasons, the stance of the SMOs within the Monitoring Committees is one of detachment and disenchantment. However, by sitting on Monitoring Committees the social partners are given the opportunity to get to know on a personal and informal basis those functionaries who wield effective decision-making power and may give them an entry-basis for future lobbying.

In examining the Swedish case, one should retain all the insights which a vast literature on the "Swedish model" has produced in the past for they appear to hold even in this case. "Sweden's policy-making culture is characterised by consensus and accommodation. Its political opportunity structure for civil society actors is shaped and influenced by the thoughts of corporatism and consensus. ... All kinds of organised interests may be recognised, provided that they effectively make claims [to represent] a significant constituency and demonstrate that they conduct themselves in accordance with the above-described norms. Therefore, organisation is central to this system and it is particularly essential to having any impact on the policy process in Sweden" (Sweden Work Package 2 Report, 4). The structure of the Swedish state is described as "hourglass

shaped”, with a very strong central level and a similarly strong local level, both endowed with far-reaching government and management competencies, while the regional level is weak both in terms of political representativeness and in terms of statutory competencies.

In France, the quest for partnership and public-private, as well as public-public, coordination is prompted by two concurrent considerations. First, as already mentioned, Structural Funds are about to run out (at least for relatively rich regions like the French regions). Given the rather poor spending record of France and the very real risk of being penalised after the mid-term assessment of 2003, coordination must be sought at all costs so as to use to their fullest the currently available Funds. Second, and subordinately, coordination with civil society actors must be sought also to improve the quality of the projects funded. Too often, the Funds have been “sprinkled” on the territory failing to have much impact. The French POS is different for the different regions. France is since 1999 experimenting with different governance structures. Three models are apparently being currently tried. The “Alsatian model” entails complete transfer of responsibilities, from ideation to implementation of the SPD, to the regional authorities and away from DATAR (*Délégation à l’aménagement du territoire et à l’action régionale*) and the regional prefects. The “Auvergne model” (experimented also in Aquitaine) implies delegation from the state to the region of all the stages of the policy process. The “Corsica model” is the classic French model: the state and the region co-manage the Structural Funds, but it is really the regional prefect that calls the tune. Partnership in France, then, has mostly to do with sharing decision-making power with lower-level governments, the Regions, who should lie closer to civil society than the highly centralised agencies of the state like DATAR (vertical partnership). The involvement of civil society organisations lies still in the background.

4.3.7. Common understanding among SMOs/MACs and with institutional actors

In the field of structural policy SMOs often work at cross-purposes, as each focuses on one aspect of structural development. Too much cluttering of SMOs in the same decision-making space may further exacerbate differences. Private-public alliances are more likely and do occur at the regional level, sometimes formally sometimes informally. In some countries there is a close understanding between the lower level associations, that is, regional and local levels (i.e. in Poland, though such shared understandings do not produce much in terms of alliances). In the Spanish case, alliances are forged particularly with political parties, whether at the EU or at the local level. There is a fairly large degree of common understanding in the UK among Scottish, Welsh and Cornish governmental

agencies and other SMOs that the most important thing is to attract money and jobs – environmental considerations tend to slip in the background; disagreement sometimes emerges on the means (and technical details) towards the shared goals. All Italian SMOs try to establish alliances with other associations sitting at the Objective 1 or 2 monitoring committees, but they feel that little had been accomplished that way. At the EU level, alliances can be formed between regional representatives, MEPs and EMOs.

4.3.8. Europeanisation of policy sector and of civil society involvement

Opinions diverge here, as some believe that structural policy is already fully Europeanised (goals, procedures, institutions, discourses). Others believe that domestic patterns of interactions are still predominant. Others still are on a mission to further Europeanise this policy field. Civil society involvement is generally considered still too slight, but inevitably so given the nature of the policy area, the mismatch between the regional character of the policy and the sectoral or single-issue nature of SMOs. The involvement of civil society in structural policy still differs from country to country but it is everywhere severely limited by the highly technical nature of the issue and the inherent mismatch between the level at which this policy is crafted and implemented and that at which SMOs are active. There is agreement on the multi-level nature of structural policy. However, there is a danger of capture of SMOs on the part of European institutions, particularly when SMOs receive most of the funds from the EU and their activity in Brussels tends to boil down to asking for more funds. Regional institutions, rather than SMOs, emerge as one of the most important channels for civil society participation in this policy sector. Trans-national contacts with other European regional SMOs are considered as very useful.

German regional authorities appear to be the real promoters of regional civil societies also at the European level: they form inter-regional coalitions to lobby Brussels through their regional offices or through the Committee of the Regions. Only very few regions (mainly only Bavaria) prefer to apply pressure onto Brussels on their own or through the national representatives. Civil society organisations are mostly absent from this level of bargaining (with the only notable exception of trans-border cooperation, an area which is at the same time trans-regional and trans-national and in which they are more agile than regional governments). Trans-national lobbying is, on the contrary, the turf of the national sections of international civil society organisations.

4.3.9. Conclusions

It would appear that SMO involvement in structural policy is still limited and rather haphazard. No clear pattern can be detected and there seems to be no uniformity in the types of organisations which are active in this policy field; rather, they reveal the idiosyncrasies of the respective national political economic systems. However, all national policy-making circles have been opened to greater civil society participation under EU pressure. Several problems still mar SMO participation, though, even in countries which are otherwise rather open to concertation such as Germany and Sweden.

Among the most felt problems are:

- 1) the mismatch between the levels at which civil society actors are best structured (which could be either national or local or both) and the level at which they are requested to act (the regional level);
- 2) the lack of civil society's interest in regional development issues and, therefore, problems with gathering and processing the information, difficulties with developing real expertise, and frustration with the incapacity to make a real contribution;
- 3) the above problems, which can be found also in governance systems where sub-national institutional and non-institutional actors are actively included into the decision-making process, are understandably bigger when the governance system is only formally implemented while their marginalisation is actively pursued in a number of more or less subtle ways;
- 4) this may happen because neither governmental institutions nor, perhaps, the civil society organisations themselves feel completely legitimated to take part in a decision-making process of which they know so little and about which they care, in the end, so little;
- 5) nevertheless, all SMOs feel that the best way to have an impact on structural developmental issues is to "play according to the rules of the game", which means preferring provision of expert knowledge, submission of petitions, lobbying activities, media campaigns and participation in decision-making forums rather than direct action.

Two tidal movements are currently meeting, thus creating a turbulence which is difficult to interpret. On the one hand, twenty years of reformed Structural Funds have inculcated

the principles of programming, monitoring, evaluation and partnership across national and regional governments. Governments have accepted, albeit reluctantly, the need to interact with civil society organisations and “social partners” in order to draft, implement, monitor and evaluate structural programs. Moreover, they have learnt to relay these same concerns at the EU level, in a host of arenas from the Council to the Commission, from the Parliament to the CoR. On the other hand, although regional participation in structural policy has been the wedge which the Commission has driven into the paralysed front of national cross-vetoes, the season of a “Europe of the Regions” now appears to be over, if only for the sheer difficulty of dealing with the some 500 regions of the enlarged (EU-25) Union. The Commission itself, therefore, often appears to waver between two alternative courses of action: pursuing cooperation with regional authorities and civil society organisations, on the one hand, and giving in to more squarely inter-governmental methods of governance, on the other. Civil society organisations feel this ambivalence and do not know whether they should stick to tried systems of interest intermediation – particularly in countries such as Sweden and Germany – where these systems are particularly well-oiled or expend time, funds and energies in playing the European game at the EU level, where they are not yet comfortable.

4.4. The Anti-Racist Sector

4.4.1. Introduction

The anti-racist field has witnessed a high level of mobilisation in Europe over the last two decades, albeit in an uneven and cyclical fashion. The heterogeneity of the field is measured in the range of counter-reactions and counter-measures taken in the face of xenophobic or discriminatory acts towards immigrant and ethnic minorities. Variations can be traced back along a trans-national comparative perspective. Internal variety within the domestic field is also high. From a comparative perspective, the distinctiveness of national citizenship and immigration regimes accounts for different degrees of protection of immigrant and ethnic minorities from racial discrimination. Thus countries with long standing immigration and extended citizenship rights, such as the UK, have witnessed the development of anti-racist movements and of advanced legislation against ethnic discrimination at much earlier stages than in most other European states. Countries with more recent immigration lag behind in terms of anti-racist policy development. However, even countries with quite long-standing immigration, such as Germany, have been notable for a late awareness of the problem and a lack of explicit legislative arrangements to combat racial discrimination.

Since the 1980s, there has been an awareness of the European dimensions of racism and xenophobia and the responsibilities of European governments and institutions to take concerted action against the problem. This was particularly so given the links between xenophobic political parties at the European level which inspired the European Parliament to take action. At the same time, the move by European governments to establish common immigration, asylum and border policies required consideration of flanking policies to ensure that such policies were applied in a non-discriminatory manner, promoted the integration of the resident ethnic minorities and avoided the development of a two-tier citizenship. Early initiatives from the European Parliament and the European Commission, including various Committees of Inquiry, led to the European Year against Racism in 1997, the establishment of the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC), and eventually the Treaty of Amsterdam agreed in 1997 which incorporated into the EU treaties the principle of non-discrimination on the basis of racial and ethnic origin (as well as gender, sexual orientation, religion, disability and age). The new Article 13 provided a mechanism whereby directives could be adopted, unanimously by the member states, in order to enforce these principles. The adoption of two directives followed on from the implementation of the treaty in 1999.

From a domestic perspective, it is hard to identify a unitary and comprehensive anti-racist movement in the countries studied. Solidarity with foreigners is expressed in very different ways and linked to highly competitive claims. The anti-racist field within each of these national contexts ranges from spontaneous ad-hoc initiatives on racist incidents, welfare-orientated groups offering social services and protection in local neighbourhoods, leftist groups targeting 'state-racism' linked to the discriminatory effects of immigration control, trade unions fighting for labour protection up to broad coalitions between government and civil society, prominent individual advocates and government sponsored agencies. Strategies also vary, incorporating lobbying, organisation of demonstrations, petitions and media and public awareness campaigns. Sometimes such organisations succeed in cultivating mass mobilisations through large-scale manifestations but most of the time they are unable to reach a wider audience. Moreover, relationships with governmental actors vary widely, depending on the type of organisation and type of claims concerned. In general however, the countries studied can be placed into three categories: i) those with long standing experiences of immigration and of developing and campaigning for policies on integrating new migrants and combating prejudice against them – in which anti-racist movements are more developed (particularly in the north of Europe, i.e. Great Britain, France, Germany, Sweden, Belgium); ii) Countries in which the immigrant experience is quite new and in which institutional, political and civil society responses have only begun to emerge in a coherent fashion in recent years (i.e. southern

European countries – Italy, Spain and Greece) and iii) countries of the former Soviet bloc (Poland and Hungary) which, though containing long standing historical minorities, have yet to experience significant immigration.

Although the project originally identified two sub-sectors within the anti-racist sector, i.e. those of i) the promotion of general anti-racist cultural values; ii) the combating of labour market discrimination, it transpired in the course of fieldwork across the countries studied that it was very difficult and in some cases impossible to distinguish between activity and organisations in these two sub-sectors, and thus the anti-racist sector was not divisible as such. Where labour market discrimination was viewed as an issue to be tackled¹² it was generally tackled in unison with racism and discrimination in general (i.e. the promotion of anti-racist values). Thus the analysis and reports that follow generally examine the anti-racist sector as one unified field.

4.4.2. Nature and Structure of MACs

Regional and National Level

The kind of organisations working in the anti-racist sector across the countries studied varies, although some common patterns are clear. Organisations can be categorised according to different degrees of institutionalisation, according to different goals in fighting various aspects of individual or collective discrimination and according to different strategies to influence policy-making. The following table indicates the different characteristics of SMOs operating in this field, although it must be noted that many organisations will often incorporate a combination of these different characteristics:

Table 8. SMO characteristics

Group of SMOs	Characteristics
Non-institutional organisations	The field is very fluid. New groups come and go. These groups tend to have little or no resources, are often excluded from public funding and generally do not draw on private donations. This restricts their radius of political activism. They are engaged in what we call <i>political anti-racism</i> . Their main concern is the promotion of an understanding of structures of marginalisation and discrimination and the prevention of subsequent forms of 'structural discrimination'. Mostly of leftist origin, these groups campaign against 'institutional racism' and call for radical policy change in citizenship, immigration and asylum law. They also look for open confrontation with right wing, xenophobic groups

¹² In Hungary it was viewed as a marginal issue given the very low involvement of migrants and minorities in the labour market. Hence, the Hungarian report instead had a section focusing on the promotion of anti-discrimination towards the Roma in the education system.

Welfare organisations	Sub-organisations of churches and trade unions. Professionalised bodies supporting victims of discrimination, promoting social integration (e.g. providing welfare services). Also make policy proposals.
Migrant organisations	Ethnically or religiously organised. Nation-wide with local sections or local initiatives. Sometimes advisory to local authorities which gives them voice and influence. Participate in activities of other organisations.
Semi-institutional organisations	Independent but government-sponsored. Campaigning and organising media events. Aim at being mediators but not considered to be independent by other organisations.
Institutional mediators	System of government agencies which mediates between foreigners and political institutions at federal, regional and local level. Seeks to include all other organisations and ensure implementation of anti-discrimination and integration policies.

One can also make the distinction between core and non-core organisations, with the former encompassing organisations with the main objective of fighting racism or promoting the integration of immigrants, and the latter encompassing organisations that campaign against racism (trade unions, church-religious organisations, NGOs) but also having broader objectives. Core organisations possess expertise and knowledge in the field and have developed particular skills of targeted lobbying whereas non-core organisations often have more resources, higher potential for mobilising public support and a broader access to the political system.

A further differentiation applies to different degrees of politicisation within the anti-racist field. Within 'mainstream anti-racism' the general solidarity of the majority population with the victims of racist attacks is mobilised targeting the racist as an individual perpetrator. Within 'movement anti-racism' re-distributive claims are raised with regard to the integration of the foreign population targeting the structural roots of racism in the restrictive immigration regimes and the authoritarian state practice linked to it.

This sophisticated range of organisations appears to be particularly characteristic of the mainly northern European countries with a longer history of immigration and a concomitant longer standing presence of ethnic minorities in need of protection against racism and discrimination. Nevertheless, the emphasis differs from country to country and some important differences are notable. In Britain for example most action against racism is channelled through the Race Equality Councils (REC), which could be categorised as semi-institutional organisations, generally funded publicly but locally organised and often having their roots originally in activist movements. Much of their funding comes through the government funded, though notionally independent, Commission for Racial Equality. However, there are also a variety of smaller non-

institutional networks fighting racism at the local level as well as larger national umbrellas. Many have been motivated by the need to confront directly the rise of a xenophobic right-wing party (such as the National Front in the 1970s or its successor the British National Party) or to tackle an outbreak in racist violence. Prominent national organisations which have developed in this way include the Anti-Nazi league, United Against Fascism and the National Assembly Against Racism. These act as umbrellas bringing together a variety of core and non-core organisations. However, there are also a variety of smaller non-institutional networks fighting racism at the local level as well as larger national umbrellas. As in Britain, the Belgian anti-racist sector appears to be dominated by a large institutionalised organisation that while publicly funded and appointed remains notionally independent. This provides official opinions on racist occurrences and provides legal support in anti-racist cases. However, reflecting the federal nature of Belgium, separate anti-racist associations are active in Flanders and Wallonia with only a few overlapping. In Sweden, the level of institutionalisation also appears strong in that most organisations receive funding from the local and national authorities. However, the range of organisations appears to be broader. This includes i) non-core national organisations which promote solidarity and progressive causes in general (not just anti-racism) and with a close relationship to public institutions, ii) outsider and migrant organisations - often nationally or ethnically organised and focusing on services and education at local level and national policy at national level, rather than political activism. iii) Larger coalitions and umbrella organisations campaigning specifically on the anti-racist theme, often of a multi-cultural and multi-ethnic nature. Similar to the British RECs, there are also a number of local anti-discrimination bureaus which fight racism with legal measures. In Germany, the anti-racism field is dominated by corporate actors, such as welfare organisations, most of them sub-organisations of the Protestant and Catholic churches but also trade unions. Their specific focus lies in anti-discrimination and on offering social services to the victims of anti-racism or to potential groups of perpetrators.

In France on the other hand, the anti-racist movement seems to have a more distinct and less institutionalised character. Reflecting the strong unitary character of the French state - most anti-racist activity is co-ordinated from the national level in the capital (though with local sections) and while less institutionalised seem more political, in that they are less reliant on public funding (being mainly dependent on funding of members) but are more inclined to be linked to a particular political formation. Thus anti-racist movements in France tend to be linked to leftist organisations, their political affiliations varying from the Socialist Party to the Communists to extremist and anarchist movements. Many have been motivated by the need to confront directly the rise of a

xenophobic radical right party (i.e. the FN). This has also been a consideration in other countries, for example in Britain, Belgium and Germany.

In Spain, Italy and Greece the heterogeneous range of organisations that have sprung up in recent years includes a small number of national organisations campaigning specifically on the core issue of anti-racism and then a much larger number of mainly local organisations that provide services or humanitarian assistance for migrants. In Italy in particular, local level organisations are often linked to leftist parties, trade unions or the church. The latter two can be categorised as 'welfare' organisations providing services to immigrants, often cooperating in this with the local authorities. There are also a large number of cultural associations, run by immigrants, funded by the local government but not really focused on campaigning. In Greece, apart from a few overtly political organisations, most organisations are based in Athens and focus on humanitarian help for refugees and migrants.

In Poland and Hungary, some similarities are clear in the emerging nature of immigration (and racism against immigrants) as an issue, as well as the general emergence of civil society following the end of decades of communism at the end of the 1980s. Nevertheless, both these countries have significant historic minorities in the form of Jews and Roma, and it is notable that in both countries anti-racist organisations focus on the defence of these groups. Nevertheless, groups in the defence of recent immigrants have also emerged. In Hungary, the role of politicians in leading the development of civil society organisations in this sector was commented on, though newer organisations have fewer connections with politics. A difference was remarked on between larger organisations with stable funding and recognition from government and international organisations and the weaker, smaller organisations which lack finances and official recognition.

The EU level

At the EU level, there are a few large and loosely organised networks that encompass a variety of social exclusion causes, such as the Social Platform, Solidar, the European Human Rights Foundation, and religious organisations. While such organisations have stressed their anti-racist concerns, particularly at key points in time such as in 1997, which was declared the European Year Against Racism, there are organisations for whom anti-racism is the main concern or a dominant one. The most prominent is ENAR – the European Network against Racism. The founding of ENAR goes back to the European Year Against Racism as the first encompassing EU initiative in the field. The 1998 Constitutive Conference of the European Network Against Racism brought more than 200

representatives of different organisations together to draw up a common programme of action. According to its self-description, the objectives of ENAR are to fight racism, xenophobia, anti-Semitism and Islamophobia, to promote equality of treatment between EU citizens and third country nationals, and to link local/regional/national initiatives with European initiatives.

Another network that came up in the research was UNITED, the European Network against nationalism, racism, fascism and in support of migrants and refugees, set up in 1992. It is a broad and open network that enables NGOs to communicate, exchange good practices and facilitate larger European campaigns. It involves voluntary cooperation among several hundred associations and initiatives from 49 European countries. UNITED engages itself in the rights of refugees and migrants and for an end to racism, nationalism and discrimination. In contrast to ENAR, UNITED has a more political agenda that includes also explicit opposition to EU policies and campaigns against 'Fortress Europe.' UNITED seeks multiple sources of funding to retain independence, but its national affiliates are wide-ranging (comprising a myriad of grass-roots organisations) and it consequently thus suffers from a fragmentation and general lack of coherence. This results in a lack of policy impact. Its location in Amsterdam also hampers its effectiveness to lobby the Brussels institutions. Nevertheless the informal contacts promoted across countries and organisations are viewed as useful for information gathering/exchanging ideas even if policy impact low.

4.4.3. Issues and Campaigns

Certain areas of activity are common throughout most of the countries studied as regards the issues and campaigns that anti-racist organisations focus on, i.e. seeking to sensitise the public as regards the rights of immigrants and ethnic minorities and the unacceptability of racism and discrimination, as well as the general promotion of the human rights of immigrants and minorities and attempts to influence policy-making in order to ensure that anti-racism measures are implemented. In countries where the extreme right and/or ethnopopulist parties are particularly strong, movements also focus on countering these phenomena. The focus on tackling the extreme right and its message was particularly notable in France, Belgium (although the emphasis on this had diminish in recent years) and Britain (although compared to the former two, the far right is much less significant). In many of the countries, there was also a focus on campaigning against racist violence and showing solidarity with its victims (e.g. Britain, Sweden, Poland).

While in the countries recently experiencing significant immigration for the first time (i.e. southern and central-eastern Europe) movements were more focused on the struggle to ensure basic human rights were respected, in the countries with a longer track record of fighting racism (usually those countries with a longer standing immigrant population) campaigning was often on a more advanced level, seeking to build on existing gains and ensure that there was no reversal and focusing on particular issues. Thus for example in Britain, there was the focus on the issue of 'kicking racism out of football.' The focus on working within the education system, given the large number of second and third generation immigrants coming through the schools was also particularly notable in this latter group of countries. Tackling discrimination in the workplace was also a major issue in these countries. There were also specific issues such as the campaign against double punishment for immigrants (conviction and later expulsion) in Belgium. Campaigns to give immigrants local voting rights were also mentioned in Belgium and Italy. This related to the general issue of citizenship rights. The difference between those countries that give second and third generation migrants born in the country citizenship rights (e.g. France, Britain) and those that do not is also very important.

Turning to the countries of southern Europe, it was notable that many associations were more occupied with their main objective of providing welfare services or humanitarian assistance to migrants, rather than active campaigning on anti-racist issues. Nevertheless, the campaign to ensure government compliance with the EU directive on instituting a national body to monitor and combat racial discrimination was noted in Italy. The political context of Italy was particularly notable here – given that an ethnopopulist party (the Lega Nord) formed part of the governing coalition. In Italy, Spain and Greece the issue of trafficking of immigrants was salient amongst anti-racist movements – the conditions of immigrants attempting to enter these countries in overloaded boats was mentioned in both Spain and Italy. In these countries there was also a focus on the plight of undocumented or clandestine immigrants. This was also a concern in France and Belgium.

In Poland and Hungary the role of international organisations in shaping the anti-racist sector was noted, thus movements were often inspired by western examples, as were issues. Thus in Poland there was a focus on defending human rights, reporting racist incidents, educating (mostly) young people, stimulating integration which would weaken prejudices and establishing changes in Polish law on refugee status and citizenship. In Hungary, most campaigning by large organisation was viewed as focused on influencing public institutions, although smaller organisations were more focused on raising public awareness. The good contact between civil society organisations and the media was also mentioned.

Turning to the EU level, the main focus for ENAR appeared to be ensuring the full implementation of the anti-racist directives and campaigning for better treatment of migrants and third country nationals in EU policies, whereas UNITED has a more political agenda that includes also explicit opposition to the EU and campaigns against 'Fortress Europe.' As stated on the UNITED Webpage: 'Fortress Europe' needs to be fought at local, regional and European levels - it cannot be fought on one level alone.

4.4.4. Public Opinion and Representativeness

With regards to the relationship between anti-racist movements and public opinion, it was notable that in this sector the level of support from public opinion as regards the movements' goals was generally viewed as lower than in the other sectors studied in the project. Movements were motivated more by a belief that what they were doing was right rather than an attempt to win popularity or represent public opinion. However, the need to sensitise public opinion was an objective which many anti-racist activists saw as central, despite a degree of pessimism as regards the attitude of the general public at large vis-a-vis the fight against racism, discrimination and prejudice. Concern was expressed about the hostile nature of public opinion as regards immigrants and ethnic minorities in most of the countries studied. Concern about the growth of the far right and the effect this had on public opinion was expressed in a number of countries, for example Italy, Belgium, France, although in the case of the latter country some encouragement was drawn from the large mobilisation against the Front National – and the subsequent large vote against it - when its leader, Le Pen, had won through to the second round of the presidential election in 2002. There was concern in some countries (Italy, France, Spain, Belgium, Britain) about the role of the media in perpetuating negative public perceptions of immigrants and minorities, while in Poland and Hungary and the Eastern part of Germany a central problem that was noted was the way in which the need to counter racism was excluded from public debate. In terms of public awareness of the EU level of anti-racist activity, again this was deemed to be very low.

4.4.5. Strategies

Strategies vary across the countries studied. Certain strategies are more common, for example trying to influence decision-making either through lobbying or taking part in formal consultation processes, organising public manifestations and launching general public and media sensitisation campaigns in order to spread understanding of the problems of racism. Strategies often differ according to the level of institutionalisation of organisations, the type of organisations and their political affiliation (if any) and make-up. In countries where institutionalisation is strong the tendency to focus strategy on

behind the scenes consultations with decision-makers, rather than through direct action (demonstrations) etc. is strong. This appears to be the case in Germany, Sweden and Belgium. In Sweden it was noted that demonstrations were not well received unless focussing on solidarity, and confrontational tactics led to exclusion. However, exclusion from decision-making in Spain and Italy means that movements in these countries focus more on other strategies, such as sensitisation campaigns and campaigning in the media as well as public demonstrations. The use of the media is generally seen as important, despite distrust about the way in which the media portrays immigrants and minorities. Lobbying, petitioning, educational and media initiatives seemed to be the preferred strategies in Greece and Poland also, while in Hungary there appeared to be greater collaboration with the governing authorities although the use of the media was also seen as very important. Institutionalised or not, movements seek to stay within the law, avoiding direct confrontation with the authorities. In some countries – particularly those with better developed anti-discrimination legislation, movements seek to use the law to their advantage, for example by filing lawsuits in cases of discrimination. This was mentioned for example in relation to France and Sweden. Many of the more welfare orientated organisations in the countries studied appeared not to have real strategies as such, as they saw their main goal as providing services to ensure the social integration of immigrants. This was noted in Italy where the catholic organisations which often provide these services have a privileged position in society and a political influence through the catholic parties.

At the EU level, multiple strategies are utilised to achieve goals such as agenda setting, acquisition of information, policy impact and to help and support movements in member states. A general feature of all strategies is the acquisition and maintenance of contacts and the development of effective and cohesive networks. Officials are contacted in a number of ways, both formal and informal. These include going to common conferences, policy seminars, and of course participation in a variety of consultation processes. Informally, strategies include finding out who is working on specific issues and contacting them personally, or mobilising existing networks for identifying areas in which influence can be productively exerted. The creation and maintenance of networks is also very important and significantly contributes to explaining the success of the anti-racist coalition.

4.4.6. Political Opportunity Structure and Institutional Contacts

There were differing perceptions as regards the level of openness and responsiveness of the political opportunity structure across the countries studied and also in relation to the differing levels of governance (EU, national, regional, local) discussed. The EU level was generally seen as offering new and in many cases, better opportunities to anti-racist movements: According to our data analysis, 47% of respondents interviewed affirmed that the EU level offers better opportunities than the national level, 4 out of 10 think that EU initiatives are very or quite helpful, while only 3% of activists tend to consider them counterproductive.

The picture at the national level was more varied. In general, a distinction can be made between countries with longer standing histories of immigration and anti-racist movements, such as the UK, France, Germany, Sweden and Belgium – where the political system at the national level was seen as fairly open – and countries of newer immigration, such as Spain, Italy and Poland, where the system was viewed as fairly closed and unresponsive. More optimism was expressed in this respect in Greece and Hungary, where the system was viewed as in a process of opening up towards the positions of anti-racist movements. In Italy, on the other hand, the political system was viewed as having closed up considerably following the change from a centre-left to a centre-right government in 2001 – with the previous relatively open dialogue being discontinued since this date. In Spain too, dialogue at the national level between movements and institutions was seen as fairly non-existent. In Greece, the fact that many leaders' of movements were also political actors meant that they often had greater informal access to decision-making, although in some cases it was noted that politicians themselves express racist opinions. As in Greece, the intermingling between the leadership of political parties and social movements was seen as an important factor in improving influence on decision-making in Hungary, although there was a general problem in that anti-racism was not seen as important or vote-winning issue. In Poland on the other hand, the political system was seen as closed and insensitive to anti-racist movements and where social movements were invited to participate in consultations, it was felt that this was only due to pressure from the European Union.

Even in those countries where the political opportunity structure was viewed as open, however, doubts were raised as to the actual policy outcomes of this openness. For example, in France, there were complaints that while the more institutionalised movements had access to and could advise politicians, they could not really influence policy and in some cases policy was implemented before the opportunity to provide advice was provided. In Germany also, official consultations were sometimes viewed as

symbolic, while in Sweden there were complaints that institutions were not really willing to debate problems of structural discrimination (and would close up when it was raised) despite the support and access afforded anti-racist organisations. In Belgium too, despite being granted access to decision-makers, movements felt that their influence was limited.

At the sub-national level, a particularly positive picture emerges in Britain, where the degree to which the RECs co-operated with local authorities was remarked open, with local authorities often being viewed as leaders in the fight against racism, for example on racial harassment in housing. Elsewhere it was notable that in two countries where the national level was seen as very closed – Spain and Italy - the regional and local level was viewed much more positively vis-a-vis the possibilities offered for collaboration. In other countries, perceptions towards the local level did not differ significantly to that of the national level. This was particularly notable in Poland where the system was viewed as closed at all levels – although some cases of specific persons being engaged in consultation at the local level were reported. In Germany, the existence of consultative bodies on projects in education and welfare at the regional level was noted, but as with the national level, there were complaints that the views of these bodies were not incorporated in the political debate. In France, the picture at the local level was more mixed, with the possibility of movements influencing decision-makers varying from municipality to municipality (for example in Lyon, influence was strong, in Marseille it was not so). Although contact was generally significant, there was a general complaint about policy advice not being translated into influence.

At the EU level, SMOs appear to face a relative openness of institutions. For both the European Parliament and the Commission, the role of social movements is important as a consequence of the perceived need for democratic legitimacy of the 'European Project.'

4.4.7. Common Understandings

In terms of common understandings between movements and decision-makers, the general pattern could be deduced from the discussion of movements' relationship to the political opportunity structure above, with the perceived degree of common understanding being higher at EU level. Although as one might expect given the sharing of the broad objective of combating racism, common understandings amongst organisations and associations working in this sector were generally viewed as good, in a number of country reports some clear divisions and in some cases conflicts emerged: There was often a division between the more institutional actors who chose to work closely with the national and sub-national authorities, and those who took a more

confrontational approach towards the political system. For example this was seen in Italy, Spain, Poland and Germany. Disagreements about sources of funding were cited in Germany, Italy, Greece and Hungary. In Greece it was noted that this led to an overall unwillingness to come together in some actions.

There were also conflicts about particular issues. In France for example, the issue of the banning of veils in state schools caused conflict between some associations who viewed this as punitive and a means of stigmatising Muslims as not-integrated and unwilling to integrate, while organisations with a more general liberal rights perspective were sympathetic to the ban as they saw it as liberating women who were otherwise being restricted in their free choice by religious leaders. This issue also caused divisions among the anti-racist movement in Germany. The treatment of Muslims and the general question of Islamophobia also caused divisions elsewhere. For example in Belgium there were conflicts between groups fighting anti-Semitism and groups fighting Islamophobia, with the former being concerned about the latter's concentration on the Palestinian question and generally disagreeing about the high amount of attention given to Islamophobia vis-a-vis anti-Semitism. In Germany, the rights or wrongs of banning far right parties was also an issue that caused a division (with liberal rights groups opposing the banning of political parties).

At the EU level, there is a sense of common understanding between all EU institutional actors and anti-racists. Both Commission officials and ENAR report sharing a common vision and a common agenda. This closeness is also present, but possibly not as strong, with other organisations whose funding is not as completely determined by EU institutions. Fundamentally there is among civil society actors a sense that the EU institutions involved in anti-racist policy (the Parliament and the relevant Commission DG) are allies and share a 'common vision' – a concept often reiterated in interviews. This said, on the subject of relations between institutional and non-institutional actors, complaints about specific issues are often voiced. For instance, there is a feeling that EU institutions do not fully appreciate the work that EU-level civil society organisations carry out, for instance they stress that they have to spend much time in checking and homogenising information and reports from member state organisations, a type of work that they think is not fully appreciated. Also lamented are excessive administrative requirements to ensure accountability, and an over bureaucratized and somewhat too literal assessment of quality in the deliverables. Another area of divergence concerns policy instruments. In general, as noted by a Commission official, EMOs tend to prefer legislative approaches while other actors, and often the Commission itself, prefer other forms of intervention.

A number of criticisms of the EU came from national level activists. Among the organisations engaged more in public campaigning there was a criticism that the EU – while adopting norms and declarations on anti-racism on the one hand – was also perpetuating a ‘fortress Europe’ mentality through the development of its common immigration and asylum policies and the identification of the immigrant with security risks (noted in Greece, Sweden, Poland, Belgium, France, the UK and Spain for example). Differences were noted between the EU institutions, with the Parliament being regarded as more open and more progressive, but having less power, and the Council being less receptive, dominated as it was by national governments who were more concerned about domestic political opinion, and where policy-making progress was hampered by the need for unanimity. Moreover, within the Commission an incongruence was noted between DG Social Affairs (dealing directly with anti-racism and seen as a positive force) and DG JLS – dealing with asylum/immigration and driven by different and more restrictive priorities, and often carrying the greater weight.

There were also concerns about the way in which anti-racism was conceptualised at the EU level. For example in France, the representative of SOS Racisme in France pointed out that the term ‘minorities’ is used in a way that is not applicable to France. Moreover, there was a distinction between anti-racist policy and the groups engaged in discussion on it, and migration policy. Thus, even ENAR faces the problem that it is often not invited to take part in consultations on migration, since the EU only looks at ENAR as an organisation involved in the anti-racist sector. And since immigration and racism are divided in the EU, ENAR is not a player in the immigration sector. Furthermore, complaints surface in Germany about the way in which the EU asks ENAR to focus on certain issues, such as racism against Sinti and Roma, which might not actually reflect the priorities in certain member states. For example, in Germany this problem is not as central as in the new member states. One further concern expressed (for example in the UK) was the shift towards submerging anti-racism within a broader human rights policy, as evidenced by the plan to convert the EUMC into a broader fundamental rights agency. It was felt that anti-racism needed to remain a separate and single policy goal.

4.4.8. Relevance of EU Policy-Making

Despite the various programmes and legislation adopted by the EU, perceptions of the EU were rather mixed among the civil society actors interviewed at the national and sub-national level. In some countries, it was seen as an opportunity and valuable resource for strengthening the fight against racism. This was particularly the case in countries where the political system at the national level was seen as closed or unresponsive, for example in Poland and Italy. However, in general there appeared to be a lack of knowledge of the

EU – as noted in particular in Britain, France and Hungary - and a detachment on the part of most national and sub-national anti-racist organisations from the activities of pan-European anti-racist networks such as ENAR. It was generally only a few larger national organisations that were involved in networks at the European level in a meaningful way.

It was often the case on the part of smaller welfare organisations operating at the local level and engaged in the delivery of services to immigrants that the EU was seen mainly as a financial resource, with funding for their activities coming from the European Social Fund. This was noted for example in Italy and Germany. However, in Greece there were complaints about the reduction of funding by the EU for humanitarian issues. There was also discussion about the implementation of EU directives and their impact on national legislation. In Sweden the impact was seen as positive – providing for a kind of moral leverage of national decision-makers. There was greater scepticism about the benefits of EU legislation in Hungary and Greece, while in Spain and Italy the complaint was that national decision-makers had failed to implement EU norms or had done so in only a limited way. In Britain, there was scepticism about the value of EU legislation as British legislation on anti-racism is viewed as being ahead of the EU and other member states in developing ways of tackling racism and discrimination. Thus many local organisations did not see the relevance of EU programmes.

4.4.9. Alliances and Networks at the EU level

All national organisations are severely restricted by resources and take an instrumental approach in considering whether to establish and maintain a presence in Brussels. When they establish a presence at EU level, they tend to use EMOs for access – because of their lack of know how there are therefore very seldom channels for access for other organisations. In addition Commission officials prefer to interact with EU level organisations. In describing the interaction a Commission official presents this preference for European level organisations in a matter of fact way 'that is their role and this is our role.' Thus there are powerful filters that select in and out different types of organisations. Interactions between national organisations and Commission officials still take place but rather infrequently, for instance the anti-racist unit of DG Social Affairs reported the frequency of interaction with national level organisations as about once monthly compared to daily contacts with EU level groups.

The general impression gained from the research was that, when it came to trans-national networking, most local organisations had little or no contact with the EU level of organisation. Moreover, they had rather limited knowledge of the EU sphere of activity in general. Local organisations were more preoccupied with dealing with issues on the

ground such as providing services or organising campaigns according to specific local concerns. Some of the local activists interviewed were rather sceptical about the real necessity and actual profits of trans-regional and trans-national networking. It was commented critically that some activists tend to spend all their time and resources developing as many outside contacts as possible. This, however, has negative side effects for their more substantial work. Becoming engaged in trans-regional or trans-national networks, groups risk neglecting their focal activities in the local neighbourhoods. For the anti-racist practice which consists of setting good examples and providing social assistance, networking is often seen of little or no use. At the national level, the situation was more mixed, with a degree of networking taking place but generally through a few major organisations. For those that engaged in EU level networks, these were seen as a resource, particularly useful for information and exchanges of ideas. The main EU network mentioned was ENAR.

Although the utility of ENAR's work was recognised, it was often viewed as a rather institutionalised body – funded as it was by the European Commission - and its network was viewed as being top-down in orientation. For example, although it provided funds for national affiliated organisations, in Germany there were complaints about conditions placed on funding by ENAR, with objectives reflecting Europe-wide priorities not always appropriate for specific national contexts. This was a problem also mentioned in Belgium. In Spain too, the difficulty in developing a common approach for different national contexts was mentioned. In France ENAR was criticised for being too slow and bureaucratic, as well as too dependent on the Commission. Such problems placed obstacles in the way of effective European networking. In Britain the view was more positive, with the ENAR viewed as extending involvement at the EU level from an activity based on getting information about what was going on to effective lobbying activities. In Italy also, the ENAR, was described as a highly professional and effective network. The role of ENAR and more generally of Brussels-based networks is recognised and appreciated.

Views of European networks – particular ENAR - were more critical in other countries. For example in France, the one representative went as far as to call ENAR an empty shell and a ghost organisation that had neither political weight nor power in the decision-making process. ENAR was accused of monopolising the funds given to anti-racist projects while being too dependent on and too close to the EU. SOS Racisme did not see the use of its ENAR membership and quit the organisation. It is now involved in a new network with similar organisations in ten countries. In Poland too, there were complaints about European platforms excluding certain organisations and acting as 'artificial' or 'puppet' organisations.

It was also reported that ENAR has a particular bias towards supporting 'mainstream anti-racism.' Grassroots members of ENAR especially have difficulties in making their voice heard and in being actively involved. This necessarily results in less influence on ENAR's decision-making structures and increases the feeling of marginalisation. Other (potential) members of ENAR reject the organisational structure and the statutes of ENAR for ideological discrepancies with some of its leading members. On the other hand, as one ENAR activist pointed out in Germany, the only way for smaller national groups to voice their opinion is through a network like ENAR which can rely on some more professional activists.

In terms of EU level networks, ENAR and UNITED have developed a quasi-monopoly of representing anti-racist concerns in Europe. The structure of the two European anti-racist networks replicates roughly the division of the anti-racist sector into so-called GONGOs (governmentally organised non-governmental organisations) and grassroots. The former prefer membership with ENAR. They have developed a relatively stable organisational structure and focus primarily on 'symbolic anti-racism' (promoting anti-racist values and 'soft policies'). The latter prefer membership of UNITED. They still rely on a very loose and unstable organisational structure and focus primarily on "political anti-racism" (calling for redistributive measures and blaming racist attitudes of political actors and institutions or the consequences of "racist policies"). We thus assume that this division line between 'GONGOs' and grassroots activists.

4.4.10. Europeanisation

The comparative overview on civil society activism in the field of anti-racism suggests that the relevance of the EU level of governance for anti-discrimination policy is perceived to be high even if knowledge among the smaller national and local organisations is often low. At the same time, anti-racist organisations occupy a rather marginal position within the field, are only partially included in the implementation process of the EU-directives, and face difficulties in raising general awareness of the importance of the EU-policy initiatives among their constituencies and the general public. The overall picture of anti-racist activism in Europe shows on the one hand very locally-based organisations, which are unlikely to be involved in supranational and trans-national initiatives, and corporatist national organisations which monopolise the European field of activism.

The importance of Europeanisation of the policy area was noted in a number of countries, notably Italy, Belgium, Hungary, Germany and the UK. In the UK, the salience of EU regulation derives from the field of discrimination on the grounds of religion, which is

neglected in British legislation, and from the field of asylum seekers and refugees. The traditional patterns of immigration in the UK are changing: new groups from different areas of the world seek to live in the country. Recent white immigration, for instance from the Balkans and Eastern Europe, does not easily fit the established patterns of race relations and represents a common area of concern in all European countries. In this light activists stress the importance of a European approach to the issue. Activists have developed an approach towards EU institutions which could be termed as conflictual cooperation. While they criticise political institutions in order to improve efforts in fighting racism, they also share the general goal of EU institutions and cooperate on a wide range of issues. Activists find EU institutions to be generally open to their concerns and quite responsive, although there is evidence of growing worries about the EU commitment to the fight against racism in the near future.

In Italy, the EU directives were seen as an important source of obligations to be fully implemented in the country. Activists use Europe to put pressure on the Italian government and its perceived lack of commitment in fighting against discrimination on the ground of race. The main institutional innovation in the policy sector – namely the creation of UNAR (the anti-discrimination unit in the Ministry of Equal Opportunities) – has been driven by the need to implement the EU directives. Thus the centre-right Berlusconi government had previously closed down the various forums set up by its centre-left predecessors to engage civil society organisations in consultation on matters relating to immigrants' status and social integration, but was forced to reinstitute contacts following the foundation of UNAR, as required by the Racial Equality directive – a clear example of the effects of Europeanisation.

In Germany, despite the long standing nature of immigration, it was not until the measures to implement the Art. 13 directives were put in place that a coherent body of legislation on anti-discrimination could be said to be in existence. However, Germany continues to be a laggard in terms of fulfilling its obligation to establish an independent monitoring body on racism and discrimination. German organisations talked of a sectoralisation and professionalisation of civil society in Europe. SMOs within European networks were treated with more respect at the European level than individual SMOs. Therefore, some SMOs joined European networks as a strategy to gain influence. This was seen as an important factor in 'Europeanising' anti-racist civil society.

European networks amplify successfully the concerns of local and national activists. Even though none of these are formally involved in any institution or institutionalised process, their amplified voice counts more than the one of any single NGO. Thus networks help to bridge the gap between the European and the national level of policy-making. The

identification and the common understanding between European and local actors is high, albeit transnational collective action and personal interchanges remain a random phenomenon. In most cases, the transmission between the different levels of policy-making goes not through active involvement and participation but through informative channels and structures of representation. A key role is played by the national coordinators of the network (in particular ENAR). This indicates the inevitability of allocating responsibilities to key positions and developing hierarchical structures within the network. In turn, a more open and independent network structure (as in the case of UNITED) might increase the legitimacy of European actors but this is paid through the price of losing policy impact and of less effectiveness in the transmission between the levels. At the end, the more open network might turn out to be the less transparent.

Assuming that the principal task of civil society consists of the politicisation of topics which were previously just discussed in private, our research demonstrates the amplification of the problem of discrimination by anti-racist activists in Europe. This positive finding is balanced by the observation that networks like ENAR did not emerge themselves, but had to be built up and financed by the European Commission.

4.4.11. Conclusion

A picture has emerged of a diverse range of movements across Europe united by the common goal of fighting racism and supporting migrants and minorities, while employing a variety of strategies and meeting with varying responses on the part of public opinion and political actors. In general a degree of pessimism reigns in which anti-racist and pro-migrant movements struggle to make an impact against a backdrop of poor financial resources, public indifference (and sometimes hostility) and political structures which, in most cases may appear fairly open, but in which an official embrace of anti-racist values often comes hand in hand with an unwillingness to move too far ahead of ambivalent public attitudes as regards the need to promote the rights of immigrants and minorities, promote their integration and protect them from racist and discriminatory actions, statements and practices. While the EU's role in introducing common anti-racist norms and financing anti-racist and pro-immigrant initiatives is recognised, perceptions of the EU are often overshadowed by the profile of its leaders in encouraging common immigration and asylum policies which reflect a 'fortress Europe' mentality, to the exclusion of non-EU nationals.

4.5. Comparative Data Analysis

4.5.1. Introduction

The following analysis compares comparatively across sectors and countries studied, utilising the findings of the data analysis employed in the research (interpretative grids and frame analysis).

4.5.2. Forms of mobilisation and participation

Table 9 below shows the distribution of different forms of actions by sectors. There are no relevant differences among sectors in terms of action repertoires: civil society organisations have a large repertoire of actions, and seek to address both institutions and the general public in order to bridge the gap between them.

Table 9. % of respondents expressing preference for a strategy

	Anti-Racism	Environmentalism	Regionalism
Direct Action	3,2	5,1	3,3
Demonstrations	8,8	9,2	5,9
Petitions	9,2	13,1	10,2
Media Campaigns	13,5	12,2	11,8
Lobbying	14,0	13,4	13,8
Judicial Actions	6,6	7,6	5,4
Participation in formal consultations	12,9	9,7	16,5
Participation in decision-making	2,8	2,8	6,6
Providing Expertise	10,6	10,7	12,0
Public Meetings	12,5	13,4	12,4
Others	5,8	2,9	2,0
	100	100	100

If we broadly distinguish between forms of action targeting the general public and forms of actions targeting political institutions, we can note some differences among the three sectors. Environmentalists are more likely to employ strategies that address the citizens compared to anti-racists and regionalists. For instance environmentalists tend to employ direct actions, demonstrations and petitions more than anti-racists and regionalist

organisations, while the latter participate more frequently in formal consultations and in decision-making processes.

In general terms, however, our results do not suggest that there are relevant differences among sectors in terms of action repertoires. Organisations do not focus on a single form of action, but tend to employ a wide set of strategies, changing them according to contingent situations and the territorial level they are to address.

However, it is not possible to say that each organisation is ready to employ whatever strategy. Particularly in the case of disruptive tactics, there is evidence of some reservations in employing them, due to a variety of motivations. The majority of associations motivate their refusal to take part in disruptive actions on the basis of both their ineffectiveness and their incompatibility with the ethic of the organisation. Some activists tend to consider that disruption can undermine their credibility as partners, precluding future initiatives in collaboration with institutions and weakening the overall impact of organised civil society in the sector.

In addition, although media campaigns have been regarded among the most effective forms of action, a number of organisations explicitly avoid them. Such decisions come very often from the impossibility of reaching the wider public in an effective way. A large number of organisations observe that the opportunity for organising wide media campaigns is severely constrained by a lack of resources, and that it is almost impossible at the national level. In some countries (such as Italy) activists stress the bias of the media, that is mainly in search of sensationalism that does not promote a serious public debate on the issues. Media campaigns are also of no use for organisations who are interested in finding concrete policy solutions rather than raising public awareness or for associations which are mainly involved in service delivery.

As noted, the general public is not necessarily a target for civil society organisations. The main focus is on influencing the public policy making agenda. Our results suggest that in all three policy sectors civil society organisations have the general desire to get included in policy processes.

4.5.3. Participation at local and national levels

There is strong evidence of the importance of mobilisation at the local and national level targeting local and national authorities. The participation in formal consultation processes is differently exercised across countries. The result can be partially explained by differences in the governance of each country. For instance, in Germany the relevance of

the national (federal) level is less central compared to Laender. The difference also reflects the distribution of competences among territorial levels.

Table 10. Participation in consultation processes at the national level by countries

Country	Often	Occasional	Rarely	No never	Not known	Total
France	9,4%	28,1%	12,5%	40,6%	9,4%	100,0%
Germany	11,4%	17,1%	2,9%	62,9%	5,7%	100,0%
Greece	21,4%	28,6%	3,6%	46,4%	0,0%	100,0%
Hungary	29,1%	40,0%	12,7%	14,5%	3,6%	100,0%
Italy	15,2%	33,3%	9,1%	39,4%	3,0%	100,0%
Poland	21,7%	28,3%	8,7%	32,6%	8,7%	100,0%
Spain	17,4%	21,7%	13,0%	47,8%	0,0%	100,0%
UK	11,1%	7,4%	55,6%	25,9%	0,0%	100,0%
Total	18,3%	27,2%	13,6%	36,6%	4,3%	100,0%

In general terms, the existence of consultations is appreciated but activists cast strong doubts on their overall effectiveness. The argument can be made quoting a German environmentalist: "We certainly get invited to all the usual hearings and to some extent we take part in working committees, but the outcome of this is incredible sparse proportional to the time, money and manpower you have to invest. To take part in proceedings only makes sense if you already have connections, if the outcome may possibly be projects, if you are able to set something in strong motion". In addition, transparency is a general requirement that is only rarely met: "in most cases you are not able to identify your concrete influence on a bill or law in the end. This applies in analogous terms to formal positions: as these positions are not published, you never know whose positions and drafts are taken on board, thus which association exerts what kind of influence". In other cases, there is the awareness that consultations are an empty exercise. For instance, in Italy the government is legally obliged to consult relevant civil society organisations when drafting the multi-annual plan for integration policy. The first plan was presented in 1998 by the D'Alema government and the last one in 2004 by the Berlusconi government. However in 2004 the consultation took place after the presentation of the document to the general public and to the mass media, and there was no space for commenting on it. The initial version of the plan remained unchanged, even if large catholic organisations and trade unions delivered written contributions asking for modifications.

All these factors contribute to lowering the degree of common understanding between social movement activists and institutional actors.

Table 11 gives evidence of the low opportunities for shared policy beliefs in all three sectors.

Table 11. Levels of common understanding between activists and national institutions by sectors

Sector	High	Moderate	A little	Not at all	Total
Anti-Racism	10,8%	31,4%	37,3%	20,6%	100,0%
Environmentalism	2,8%	26,6%	34,9%	35,8%	100,0%
Regionalism	9,4%	32,8%	43,8%	14,1%	100,0%
Total	7,3%	29,8%	37,8%	25,1%	100,0%

A rather different picture emerges from results at the regional (and local) level, where higher levels of common understanding can be observed. This result confirms a broad trend in local governance. Indeed, the literature on local governance highlights the impact of partnerships on how policies are delivered, and that forms of collaboration among local authorities and local associations are well-established in all countries.

Table 12. Levels of common understanding between activists and regional institutions by sectors

Sector	High	Moderate	A little	Not at all	Total
Anti-Racism	18,3%	35,5%	38,7%	7,5%	100,0%
Environmentalism	7,4%	34,7%	35,8%	22,1%	100,0%
Regionalism	27,0%	45,9%	23,0%	4,1%	100,0%
Total	16,8%	38,2%	33,2%	11,8%	100,0%

4.5.4. Participation at the European level

The changes in systems of governance and their consequences in terms of democratic public control are made even more complicated in the European context. The multi-level character of the European polity implies the need for social and institutional actors to be active at different territorial levels simultaneously. Policy delivery results from the interaction of actors involved at different territorial levels. In this context the assessment of political opportunities for civil society organisations to voice their concern at the EU level is of central importance. As Marks and McAdam (1996) noted, the characteristics of

the EU system of governance make it more likely to lead to institutionalised forms of actions, like lobbying and forms of conflictual cooperation (Giugni and Passy 1998).

Our results suggest that 16% of interviewed organisations affirms to have “often” or “occasionally” been involved at the supranational level (see below). On the whole, civil society organisations find it potentially useful to address European policy processes, but they face several difficulties for getting involved at the European level. This general statement needs to be specified, as there are huge variations among sectors and among countries, as we will see.

Relevance of the European level for civil society organisations

European policies are perceived to be of central importance in the context of environmentalism and structural regionalism, while there are significant differences across countries in relation to the perceived relevance of EU regulations in the fields of anti-racism and of the protection of minority languages. In particular Italian, Spanish, Greek anti-racist activists note that initiatives at the EU level allowed them to put the issue on the domestic agenda. In such countries the fight against racism was completely marginal until the EU intervention in the sector. On the contrary, where a well-established national tradition in policies for fighting discrimination is present, such as in Sweden and in the UK, European directives are perceived to be of little use. For instance both social and institutional British actors agree on the idea that European anti-discrimination principles have been implemented for addressing problems and filling gaps that are present elsewhere in Europe. In principle, a similar divide could be observed in the field of environmentalism: northern countries have been traditionally more active in promoting environmental protection, while southern European countries and new accession countries showed a delay. However, environmental policy dates back to the 1970s and at present all activists tend to recognise the importance of EU regulation in the sector.

A specification is needed in the case of language minorities; even if the institutions of the European Union are not of central importance for activists, an European dimension of mobilisation is highly evaluated. It is “Europe” and not the “European Union” to be of relevance.

This is also the case of the more specific mobilisation against expansion of airports: our results suggest that even if the EU institutions have no specific power for decisions over national plans for the development of infrastructures and the policy area is not Europeanised, there is the awareness of the importance of rising the issue at the EU level, because local communities who live nearby airports face similar problems. Such

results give some strength to the hypothesis formulated by Kohler-Koch that the formation of interest groups is an anticipation of future developments at the supranational level¹³, an anticipation aiming at gaining influence over the definition of a policy area and its basic directions (Kohler-Koch 1994).

Participation at the EU level: differences among countries

The comparative dimension of the CIVGOV project allows addressing an important question about the existing differences in the potential for mobilisation across European countries. Are the opportunities for participation at the European level equally distributed among nationally-based organisations? Have facilitating and constraining factors the same impact on nationally-based organisations?

Table 13 shows differences in levels of involvement in EU policy processes. Countries can be grouped according to the overall low, medium, high level of participation.

Table 13. Level of involvement in EU policy processes

Often or Occasional Involvement	
Low (Less than 10%)	UK, Hungary
Medium (Between 10% and 20%)	France, Germany, Greece
High (More than 20%)	Italy, Poland, Spain

The first important observation to be made is that on the whole the majority of interviewed nationally-based organisations do not get involved in EU policy processes. Time and budgetary constraints, lack of knowledge about opportunities for participation, linguistic problems, lack of experience, are all factors that contribute to limit participation of civil society organisations in the European arena. Even if, as we noted above, the perception about the relevance of the European level is diffused, this does not constitute a sufficient reason for getting involved and does not necessarily lead to an effective involvement. The costs of transnational mobilisation are too high to be easily met.

What are civil society organisations doing in the EU arena? Scholars in the field of social movements observe the general lack of forms of demonstration at the European level: traditional street mobilisations have been rarely organised in Brussels. Our results show

¹³ Such hypothesis is usually contrasted with the opposite one, stating that the formation of public and private interest groups is a reaction to the Europeanisation of a policy sector.

that civil society organisations are mainly trying to lobby EU institutions and are interested in participating in meetings and hearings. Taking part in such events is extremely important for constructing solid relationships, both with EU civil servants and activists from other member states. In this light, attending meetings are opportunities for networking and for gathering information on what is going on in the European arena.

In addition, European lobbying can prove useful for impacting on national structures and policies. First, involvement at the EU level is perceived to be a useful strategy if it allows activists to put national governments under pressure. In the attempt to impact on decisions over transport policy activists are generally inclined to lobby regional or national institutions (there are differences among countries) because competences for the development of infrastructures are allocated at those levels. However the EU environmental competences and the need for assessing the environmental impact of infrastructure provide civil society organisations with an additional opportunity for influencing the national decision-making process. In these cases information on EU regulations are needed and activists mainly refer to Brussels-based organisations in order to gather information. A British example is useful to illustrate this point: activists contested the plans for expansion at airports included in the Aviation White Paper of 2003 with the argument that, according to EU requirements on environmental protection, plans for development have to be scrutinised in the ideational stage and not in the implementation stage as suggested by the UK government. In this case activists sought to warn their national administrations on the non-observance of European environmental legislation. Very similar examples can be found in Spain, where activists utilise this kind of strategy very extensively.

The second factor that civil society organisations take into account when deciding whether to address EU institutions is the opportunity for provoking changes in closed national policy communities. Again the example of expansion at airports is useful: the existence of a strong environmental lobby at the supranational level dealing with the issue of global warming forced national pro-business policy communities to pay attention to the environmental impact that expansion at airports has at the global level. Consequently, a typically local issue has been reframed in global terms, and as a result in the UK, Germany, France and Spain it proved impossible to keep environmental concerns off the agenda. Environmentalists have been able to enter the policy community in the transport sector, not because of the impact of airports on the living conditions of the population nearby, but because of the living conditions of the global community. In other words in this particular case the Europeanisation of civil society is leading to a reframing of the issue: from a local problem with a NIMBY character to a European issue with a global impact.

Participation at the EU level: differences among sectors

Table 14 shows differences among sectors in the frequency of participation in EU policy consultation processes.

Table 14. Frequency of participation in EU policy consultation processes

Sector	Often	Occasional	Rarely	No never	Not known	Total
Anti-Racism	6,3%	10,0%	10,0%	68,8%	5,0%	100,0%
Environmentalism	2,7%	9,8%	11,6%	64,3%	11,6%	100,0%
Regionalism	13,6%	13,6%	10,2%	57,6%	5,1%	100,0%
Total	6,4%	10,8%	10,8%	64,1%	8,0%	100,0%

A specification is needed in the case of regionalism, as the two sub-sectors present different characteristics and the level of relevance of the EU is very different in the case of Structural Funds, where obviously European institutions matter, and the protection of minority languages, where the competences of the EU are limited. Activists widely recognise the marginal role played by EU institutions in this policy area and our results suggest that the minority languages representatives do not take part in EU policy processes. Consequently, in the rest of this section, the term “regionalism” refers primarily to organisations involved in Structural Funds. It must be noted however that, even if the European institutions are of no relevance for minority groups, a more generic European dimension, that is “Europe”, is perceived to be important.

Anti-racists and environmentalists appear to be equally far from EU, being directly involved only rarely in Brussels-based activities.

We have referred already to a number of criticisms towards the effectiveness and transparency of consultation exercises at the national level. Evaluations on consultation processes at the EU level are contrasting: on the one hand procedures are perceived to be more transparent, as guidelines for consultation are known and the main steps in the policy process can be found on the web, on the other they are supposed to be remote. In any case, as

Table 15 below shows, consultation exercises are more likely to be judged in a positive way.

Table 15. Usefulness of participation in consultation processes at the EU level by sectors

Sector	Useful	Ambivalent	Not useful	Total
Anti-Racism	66,7%	23,8%	9,5%	100,0%
Environmentalism	51,7%	44,8%	3,4%	100,0%
Regionalism	47,8%	47,8%	4,3%	100,0%
Total	54,8%	39,7%	5,5%	100,0%

This general impression is partially confirmed by the high level of common understanding over policy issues that can be observed. There are some difference among policy sectors to be pointed out. In the regionalist sector there appears to be a high level of understanding (again the result refers mainly to organisations involved in Structural Funds), while environmentalists express a higher level of criticism. In the anti-racist sector, activists express their concern over the persistence of political willingness for tackling racism. Current developments in the sector, in particular the transformation of the EUMC into a new Fundamental Rights Agency with an extended remit, have been regarded worrying signals of a decreasing centrality of the fight against racism at the EU level.

Table 16: Perceived level of common understanding between activists and EU institutions by sectors

Sector	High	Moderate	A little	Not at all	Total
Anti-Racism	37,3%	34,9%	13,3%	14,5%	100,0%
Environmentalism	14,3%	47,3%	28,6%	9,9%	100,0%
Regionalism	41,8%	32,8%	14,9%	10,4%	100,0%
Total	29,9%	39,0%	19,5%	11,6%	100,0%

4.5.5. Openness and Responsiveness

The following three tables aim at highlighting differences in perceived openness of EU, national and regional institutions to claims made by civil society organisations.

Table 17. Perceived Openness of EU institutions by sectors

	Very Open	Moderate	Low	Closed	Total
Anti-Racism	39,1%	39,1%	17,4%	4,3%	100,0%
Environmentalism	25,0%	41,7%	19,4%	13,9%	100,0%
Regionalism	31,1%	48,9%	17,8%	2,2%	100,0%
Total	30,7%	42,9%	18,4%	8,0%	100,0%

Table 18. Perceived Openness of National institutions by sectors

	Very Open	Moderate	Low	Closed	Total
Anti-Racism	19,7%	18,4%	42,1%	19,7%	100,0%
Environmentalism	2,8%	35,2%	38,9%	23,1%	100,0%
Regionalism	7,1%	41,1%	26,8%	25,0%	100,0%
Total	9,2%	31,3%	37,1%	22,5%	100,0%

Table 19. Perceived Openness of National institutions by sectors

	Very Open	Moderate	Low	Closed	Total
Anti-Racism	12,5%	47,5%	33,8%	6,3%	100,0%
Environmentalism	7,2%	33,0%	41,2%	18,6%	100,0%
Regionalism	25,6%	43,6%	17,9%	12,8%	100,0%
Total	14,5%	40,8%	31,8%	12,9%	100,0%

Over 50% of interviewed activists affirm that EU institutions provide them with better opportunities for participation than the national institutions. It is of note that such positive evaluation has been also expressed by organisations that do not engage in activities at the supranational level. More experienced activists tend to express a more articulated evaluation of the level of openness, noting that European institutions have different degrees of perceived openness. In comparison, the European Parliament is more easily accessible, while the Council is considered to be very closed. Different opinions have been elaborated with reference to the European Commission, according to contingent situation. For instance, anti-racists think the DG Employment and Social Affairs to be open to their proposals, while they found it very difficult to deal with DG Justice, Freedom and Security which was in charge of the transformation of the EUMC into the Fundamental Rights Agency. In this light the 2002 Communication from the Commission "Towards a reinforced culture of consultation and dialogue - General

principles and minimum standards for consultation of interested parties by the Commission” (COM(2002) 704 final) has been appreciated as a attempt for making procedures more uniform, even if in the context of written consultations and public hearings only. It is of note that openness depends mainly on informal relationships. In the words of a British activist: “my opinion is that they (the EU institutions) are open, if you know the way in... Unless you have personal contact it is extremely difficult to pick up the relevant institutions and the relevant people”. The situation changes once an organisation manages to enter the system; from that point consultations and invitations to participate in meetings and conferences are sent on a regular basis, and information on the institutional agenda becomes available.

In this light it can be useful to analyse at which stage of the policy process civil society organisations are included. Our data suggest (see

Table 20 below) that 15% of organisations in our sample took part in EU policy processes in their ideational stage, providing ideas and suggestions on policy solutions. The percentage falls to 3 and 5% respectively in the case of decision-taking and implementation, and increase to 7% for monitoring activities.

Table 20. Participation of civil society organisations in different stages of policy making at different territorial level (N:364)

	European level	National level	Regional level	Local level
Ideational	15,3%	39,5%	47,2%	51,3%
Decision-taking	3,2%	13,4%	15,6%	21,7%
Implementation	5,2%	14,5%	21,1%	25,2%
Monitoring	6,8%	15,6%	23,9%	28,5%

Table 21. Perceived Responsiveness of EU institutions by countries (N: 330)

Country	Very responsive	Moderately	Low	No never	Total
France	21.4%	35.7%	7.1%	35.7%	100.0%
Germany	13.3%	56.7%	30.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Greece	46.2%	38.5%	0.0%	15.4%	100.0%
Hungary	29.6%	40.7%	11.1%	18.5%	100.0%
Italy	20.0%	20.0%	13.3%	46.7%	100.0%
Poland	15.4%	38.5%	19.2%	26.9%	100.0%
Spain	0.0%	57.1%	38.1%	4.8%	100.0%
UK	12.5%	12.5%	25.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Total	19.0%	41.1%	18.5%	21.4%	100.0%

Table 22. Perceived Responsiveness of EU institutions by sectors (N:330)

Sector	Low	Moderately	No never	Very responsive	Total
Anti-Racism	2,0%	34,0%	40,0%	24,0%	100,0%
Environmentalism	31,6%	36,8%	14,5%	15,8%	100,0%
Regionalism	14,0%	55,8%	11,6%	18,6%	100,0%
Total	18,3%	40,8%	21,3%	18,9%	100,0%

Activists identify a number of factors that lead institutional actors to be responsive to their claims. A first reason refers to the need for specific expertise that civil society organisations are able to provide. Secondly, the perceived representativeness and the ability of social actors to aggregate their preferences presenting a unified position on a specific matter is a facilitating factor. This is confirmed by interviewed institutional actors. According to them, the internal fragmentation of civil society is an obstacle and a negative factor. In addition, the precariousness of associations is another factor that has a negative impact on the possibility for influencing decision-makers.

Whatever the perceptions about the openness and the responsiveness of public institutions, the majority of civil society organisation thinks that political institutions are biased, and that economic interests have more opportunities for expressing their preferences and impact on final decisions.

4.5.6. Representativeness

Representativeness: civil society and public opinion

We have noted that civil society organisations are expected to input expertise and information into policy processes, contributing to make decisions closer to public preferences and more legitimate. In addition to this, civil society organisations are supposed to socialise citizens to new complex political processes, making them more aware of both opportunities and constraints to political authorities. In the present system of multi-level governance political authorities are expected to deliver efficient solutions to issues that are only partially under their control. In this sense, the socialising effect of civil society can help political authorities in making citizens less demanding and more aware of existing limits in resources. In our interviews with institutional actors we found that high public expectations are a serious issue to be addressed and that participatory devices can help in providing people with information about real opportunities for delivering policy solutions. In this sense, the main benefit expected by institutional actors in dealing with civil society organisations consists of sharing information and (to some extent) responsibility over public services. At the European level, the socialising function of civil society can help EU institutions in overcoming its remoteness, diffusing information about initiatives and results.

Our results suggest that such educative or socialising functions have been taken on board by a minorities of organisations included in our sample. More specifically, in the anti-racist sector, only a part of organisations are interested in performing an educative role, while the majority are more focussed on finding solutions for providing victims of discrimination with valuable help. Such a divide reflects two very different understanding of what the fight against racism is about: an effort for making white people aware of the dangers and unfairness of racism vs. the protection of individual rights of members of racial and ethnic minorities. The picture is partially different in the environmental sector. It is important to stress that a Eurobarometer survey in 1999 showed that consumer and environmentalist organisations are highly trusted as sources of information among EU citizens (55% and 45% respectively), while only 3% of EU citizens consider political parties and industries reliable sources of information. Indeed interviewed organisations are aware of the support of public opinion. As Table 23 below shows, only a minority of environmentalists think that citizens express a low level of support for their concern. Almost 50% experience positive feedback from the general public. On the contrary, anti-racists express their dissatisfaction with the level of public support they feel that they enjoy. Such perceptions have a strong impact on strategies: while (as noted above) environmentalists are likely to mobilise the general public in order to gain visibility, anti-

racists tend to de-politicise the issue, and regionalists are mainly focussed on their local constituencies, on the whole paying little attention to national and European public spheres.

Table 23. Estimated levels of public support by sectors

Sector	High	Moderate	Low	Total
Anti-Racism	31.4%	39.0%	29.7%	100.0%
Environmentalism	49.7%	37.3%	13.1%	100.0%
Regionalism	39.7%	44.9%	15.4%	100.0%
Total	41.3%	39.5%	19.2%	100.0%

In general terms, institutional actors are aware of the high level of credibility enjoyed by environmentalists on the GMO issue and on food safety. In our interviews we found that institutional actors tend to recognise such influence over the general public, even if there are evidences that they consider the reliability of the information provided flawed. More specifically civil society organisations are often found to be inaccurate in papers that outline their position, especially from a scientific point of view (“you can’t forget that they have an agenda” Defra, UK); thus, if it is possible to suggest that they socialise/introduce the public to the issue, it is not possible to affirm that they educate it. Such expression of doubt does not lead us to deny the importance of civil society contribution to the debate in a European public sphere. It is important to stress however that public opinion can be important for instrumental reasons, since it strengthens activists in their efforts to achieve policy results.

Representativeness: civil society organisations and their membership

In the previous paragraph we argued that civil society organisations do not claim to represent the general public, rather they refer to a precise constituency or their members. Table 24 below shows our empirical results on this aspect by sectors:

Table 24. Perceived constituencies by sectors

	Anti-Racism	Environmentalism	Regionalism	Total
Citizens	15,97%	28,77%	17,33%	21,76%
Civil society	15,97%	14,38%	14,67%	15,00%
Global community-the planet-future generations	5,04%	15,07%	10,67%	10,59%

Membership	16,81%	10,96%	22,67%	15,59%
Non territorial group/category	41,18%	10,27%	8,00%	20,59%
Territorial group	5,04%	19,86%	26,67%	16,18%
Total	100,00%	100,00%	100,00%	100,00%

In this light it is important to assess internal representativeness, that is the involvement of membership in determining the preferences and the strategies of the association. The issue is highly sensitive and it has been widely debated in the literature on interest intermediation. As Berger noted (1983), the iron-law of oligarchy is the most famous example of theoretical reflections on the matter: the elite of an organisation is expected to develop strategies according to its own interest, positioning the organisation accordingly.

Usually, local and national political authorities set basic requirements to be matched for having access to consultation and policy formulation processes, while in general terms EU institutions do not list any specific requirement in order to include an association in the CONNECS database or to accept contributions to written consultation processes. At national level a formal statute and internal democratic mechanisms are the most common requirements to be met, and indeed they are widely adopted by civil society organisations. Our results suggest that more than 65% of associations organise internal elections open to members to select their leaders, while appointment by board and self-selection are procedures employed by around 10% of associations respectively. All organisations provide their members with information, using different channels. More often members are kept informed through the website (regularly updated by 7 organisations out of 10) and newsletters and internal meetings (in both cases regularly adopted by 6 organisations out of 10). Members are expected to discuss often both the general goals of the associations (33%) and more detailed policy positions (25%). In 30% of associations members are involved in consultation exercises, while a very small minority of associations does not involve the membership in internal decision-making processes.

4.5.7. European Networks: contacts with umbrella organisations and alliances

So far, we have argued that locally and nationally-based associations face severe difficulties in getting involved at the European level on a regular basis. The complexity of the European system of governance, the need for a simultaneous presence at different territorial levels, budget and time limits are all constraining factors for an effective

participation of associations at the supranational level. In this context the role of Brussels-based umbrella organisations gains relevance. Indeed their ability in shaping civil society preferences to be channelled appears to be quite high: there is the perception that even when small local organisations are members of EU networks, it does not follow that they are able to be active members, for example in using EU networks for transmitting their own policy preferences to EU decision-makers or making their voice heard.

On the whole, our results suggest that the positive role of umbrella organisations is generally recognised, as well as their expertise and their ability to make an impact on EU policy processes. There are criticisms when the dependency of umbrella organisations from the EU Commission for funds is perceived to be too strong.

On the whole activists tend to consider that lobbying EU institutions in an effective way is a full-time job that requires a specific investment in terms of time and resources. Particularly in the environmental sector, a clear division of roles between umbrella and nationally-based organisations emerges.

Table 25. Members of umbrella organisations by countries

Country	Member of umbrella organisation
France	33.3%
Germany	50.0%
Greece	58.2%
Hungary	35.7%
Italy	52.4%
Poland	35.4%
Spain	34.8%
UK	13.3%
Total	40.7%

It is interesting to question the extent to which the presence of Brussels-based networks enhances the opportunities for participation. It is of note that the relationship between nationally-based organisations and umbrella organisations is mainly based on the exchange of information on EU policy and funding opportunities. As noted participation in meetings, conferences, formal consultation processes are all forms of action that are said to be useful but not effective in terms of impact of policy processes. The usefulness of formal participation consists of the opportunity for sharing experiences and for

accumulating knowledge. In other words, even if smaller groups are able to gain access and participate in Brussels, only powerful networks are perceived to be able to act effectively. In particular it emerges that ad hoc lobbying (on a single piece of legislation for instance, or for a limited period of time) seems to be ineffective. In addition, lobbying activity requires a high level of knowledge, both about the scientific aspect of the issue and about the European political environment and these conditions seem to be highly selective in favour of large groups and Brussels-based organisations. In terms of frequency (see Table 26 below), members of networks tend to have frequent contacts, mainly through newsletters and other sources of information, and there are not differences among sectors.

Table 26. Frequency of contacts between nationally-based civil society organisations and umbrella organisations based in Brussels (N:190)

Sector	Frequent	Occasional	Rarely/Never	Total
Anti-Racism	58,0%	35,4%	6,4%	100.0%
Environmentalism	60,7%	36,7%	2,5%	100.0%
Regionalism	57,1%	32,6%	10,2%	100.0%
Total	58,9%	35,2%	5,8%	100.0%

4.5.8. Conclusions

On the whole the analysis allows us to give empirical evidence of dynamics in a highly sensitive aspect of European political life. The role of functional representatives that civil society organisations are increasingly called to play at all territorial level has been mainly explored from a normative point of view, attempting to clarify whether it is plausible to expect civil society to play such a demanding role in political life. The aggregation and representation of public preferences, the educative and socialising function are all open questions that the CIVGOV project explored with a comparative approach. In conclusion of this chapter we can briefly ask what the relationship between organised civil society and the broad process of European integration could be. Wessels (2004) highlights the positive association between new social movements and support for EU integration: pro-environment groups, anti-racists, consumer groups etc. are likely to take a pro-integrationist position. In this light they can be contrasted with workers and professional groups, which in the last 15 years promoted the large part of popular demonstration at the EU level, mainly on the basis of an anti-integrationist argument. Such position comes from the argument that the development of the EU can be considered in many respects a threat to the practices of citizenship as they have been developed in the context of nation-states. Accordingly, the defence of citizenship rights and provisions can be

pursued in opposition to Europe and in particular to the market-driven logic of integration.

In our interviews a general support for further Europeanisation of policy sectors can be found: Europe is mainly regarded as an opportunity, even if its complex nature and its lack of transparency are stressed as serious problems to be addressed. It is of note, however, that such suggestions lead to a demand for reform of EU policy processes and institutions, making them more open, but do not lead to criticism for the EU integration process as a political project. With the exception of very critical anti-racists, who tend to criticise EU politics on the basis of the notion of "Fortress Europe", strong opposition to the EU project is very marginal in our sample. Why do new social movement organisations take a favourable view of the EU and are even in favour of a further Europeanisation? We found that getting involved in the supranational arena can have an important impact at national level, opening up the opportunities for putting some pressure on un-responsive national governments.

What is of interest here is the perception that effectiveness requires acting at different territorial level simultaneously, in order to address the multi-level character of the European polity. This is a challenging aspect of involvement in EU policy making, which highlights the important role played by umbrella organisations.

4.6. The EU Level

4.6.1. Introduction

Considerations regarding political opportunity structures for and representativity of EMOs in European policy making often end up under general considerations about lobbying in the EU. However, EMOs have some features which distinguish them from private lobbying actors, which provides them on the one hand with a certain claim of representativity and on the other hand implies recourse to different strategies and instruments to make their voices heard. However, the analysis undertaken makes clear that even among EMOs there is considerable variation. In particular, EMOs in the regionalism sector have more of a political nature which other EMOs lack. But also within the policy sectors there is variation with some organisations being more networks, others focusing more on expert advice, while still others more focused on campaigning strategies. It is difficult then to make single conclusions for organisations that have different features.

In terms of political opportunity structures the general assessment can be called rather positive, although EMOs ask in particular for less bureaucratic procedures regarding

funding, a less technical language use and overload of documents, and more time to be able to consult their national member organisations.

EMOs do not always seem to respect the bottom up democratic internal structure that one would expect, but the complete picture of EMOs active in particular policy sectors seems fairly representative in that organisations complement one another.

The most important findings of our research on EMOs can be summarised around the two perspectives central to our research: political opportunity structures and representativity.

4.6.2. Political opportunity structures

Openness and responsiveness

The analysis of the three policy sectors makes clear that openness and responsiveness depends on different aspects.

First of all, openness and responsiveness differs according to policy sector, and even within policy sectors, actors in sub-sectors conceive openness and responsiveness differently.

Second, the organisational features of the EMOs themselves play a role. EMOs with a permanent office in Brussels in general consider the EU institutions more open than those not having a permanent office. Also the collaborative or rather confrontational nature of EMOs plays a role: the first consider EU institutions more open than the latter. Finally, among our three sectors analysed, we should also distinguish between on the one hand environmental and anti-racism EMOs and on the other hand regionalist EMOs. The latter relate also to constituencies with an electoral basis and political nature: this is an advantage in terms of political weight which the other organisations lack.

Third, the different EU institutions are open and responsive to different extents. In general, the European Parliament and the Commission are considered rather open whereas the Council is perceived as rather closed. However, also here one should distinguish between policy sectors. For instance, in the environmental field, the sector of GMOs is a very contested one, in which case the Commission is perceived as not very open and not responsive to civil society. In transport on the other hand, it appeared easier to find some common ground. Or in the case of regionalism, the sector of structural funds finds particularly openness in the Commission, whereas EMOs in the sector of minority languages find more support in the Parliament than in the Commission.

In general EMOs consider the system open but only on the condition that 'one has something on offer', be it either expertise or representative voice. Regarding responsiveness, EMOs themselves argue it is very difficult to make any assessment.

Degree of common understanding

EMOs and institutional actors do not stand at opposite sites. On certain issues they will agree on problems, strategies and solutions. Whether there is a common ground of understanding between EMOs and institutional actors differs according to policy sector.

In particular in the field of anti-racism one has seen strong examples of common understanding and of movement advocacy coalitions between EMOs and institutional actors favouring anti-racist values. In the field of environmental policy the picture is more shaded. Although there have been good examples of advocacy coalitions in the environmental field, the two sub-sectors under analysis in this project are more problematic in this sense. On transport there is sometimes some common understanding, but most activism of environmental organisations takes place at local level and may regularly be in contestation with European initiatives. The sector of GMO is most difficult, as the EU institutions and the environmental movement have a clearly opposed view on the issue.

In the sector of regionalism, EMOs and institutional actors express satisfaction regarding common ground on general principles related to regionalism such as subsidiarity and proximity. In the case of linguistic minorities, common understanding has changed over time, with a stronger support immediately after 1989, but less policy salience at the turn of the century, with currently again some more interest. In any case, EMOs often argue that they find more support for the regionalist case at the European level than in some of the Member States.

Factors and strategies in gaining access

Both according to EMOs and institutional actors, expertise is the most important factor to gain access. This occurs in all policy sectors. In the regionalist sector, though, 'the sheer political weight behind European associations of regional actors' is also considered a very important factor to gain access, an element which is obviously absent for environmental or anti-racist organisations.

EMOs spent most of their time on lobbying and advisory work, although media campaigns, demonstrations, petitions and legal action are not entirely excluded. Again, differences can be noted according to policy sectors. In much contested areas, such as GMOs, media campaigns are proven more powerful instruments than lobbying to

influence policy-making. It is worth in fact making a more general observation that in contrast to the standard assumption that 'politicisation' at EU level would not really work, EU institutional actors actually considered media campaigns as a potential powerful strategy in all three policy sectors, including regionalism.

This does not mean, though, that all EMOs are ready to engage in media campaigns. There is even a sort of specialisation among EMOs which may lead to a certain division of work – even if not explicitly agreed. In the environmental sector, for instance, the European Environmental Bureau and Transport & Environment focus on lobbying and advisory work, whereas Greenpeace and Friends of the Earth will (also) engage more in 'politicising' activities.

Still, for many organisations that do use petitions, marches or other repertoires of the social movement sector, they will not do this in Brussels.

Organisational level and political opportunity structures

EMOs are only one organisational level of social movements to get access to EU institutions. National or local level organisations may equally influence EU policy making. They would most likely do so by interaction via the national level, but they may also do so by interaction directly with EU institutions. From the point of view of the EU institutions, do they privilege some actors over the other?

The Commission clearly prefers to deal with EMOs rather than with national organisations, in order to reduce the complexity of the consultation process and in order to have a more representative picture. The European Parliament is less decisive in this sense in that it interacts both with EMOs and national social movement organisations without expressing a clear preference as the Commission does. Access to the Council, instead, mainly happens through national organisations acting at the national level, with the EMOs having only a minor role.

EMOs can play some role as coordinator of their national organisations acting on European issues. Most generally they provide information on European issues to their member organisations, but they can occasionally also suggest lobbying particular actors involved at the national level. Yet EMOs always stress in this context that the national organisations are 'independent' and 'autonomous' in their action.

In addition to EMOs and national movement organisations, the picture of movement organisations active at the European level is further complicated by the European Platform organisations which resemble several EMOs, such as the Green 10 or the Social Platform. EMO representatives consider platform structures as a practical tool for

collaboration and exchange of information among the constituting EMOs, in particular in relation to building up common intelligences of dealing with Brussels. Only very occasionally Platforms provide an opportunity for common projects among the EMOs composing it.

From the outside, i.e. as seen by institutional actors, the Platforms are not always perceived as real actors. The Commission staff dealing with policy drafting often do not deal with them, as they prefer dealing with the composing EMOs. EMO representatives, though, argue that Platforms give them greater visibility and representativity at the higher political level of decision-making. Platforms are important for public awareness campaigns whilst policy details are discussed in more specific fora and informal interactions with EMOs.

Assessment of formal access channels

The European Commission

Access to the European Commission is described as strongly different according to the DGs. In the environmental policy sector, for instance, DG Environment is considered as most open to the demands of environmental EMOs. SANCO (public health) is considered as less open, but still more open than Agriculture or Trade. It is also mentioned that a Director General can have a particular influence in the way the DG interacts with the outside world.

Regarding the use of Green and White Papers and online consultations, there is some scepticism among EMOs on whether these instruments have any influence. Therefore, they argue that - given also their limited resources - they prioritise other strategies. Even within the Commission there is no unanimous support on the added value of the strong increase of electronic consultations. Interviewees in the Commission provided mixed answers on the output of these consultations. Generally it is argued that it may be too early to assess but that it is clear that it takes up considerable resources within the Commission.

This is also criticised from the EMO side as including certain risks, namely if the Commission spends much resources on the formal (online) consultation it may have less time and resources to spend on more informal consultations which allow the provision of information beyond the standard questionnaires of the online consultation.

This leads us to a broader consideration, limited resources is not only a problem of EMOs but also of the Commission. EMOs, for instance in the anti-racist sector, complain that the DG in this area is understaffed, and therefore is limited in the attention it can pay to

civil society organisations. EMOs, for instance, would like more feedback on their position papers.

In any case, informal bilateral consultations are said to be more important than online consultations, as well as consultations through advisory committees.

The European Parliament

The European Parliament interacts with both EMOs and national SMOs. It is generally considered accessible, independent of the policy sectors.

In their lobbying action on the European Parliament, EMOs focus on institutional responsibility and identify their interlocutors on this basis. National SMOs instead focus on their national representatives in the European Parliament.

The Council

The Council is generally considered the most closed institution. While contacting in Brussels appears difficult 'since the people in Brussels are nearly ambassadors', social movements will act through the national level.

Yet, regional EMOs still see a potential influence by involving their political heavyweights in lobbying the Council. This option is not available for environmental or anti-racist EMOs. A representative of an EMO in the anti-racism sector mentioned though that knowing people in the Secretariat of the Council can provide an important additional channel for access.

The European Economic and Social Committee

The EESC has undertaken over recent years particular efforts to improve its role of 'representative forum of civil society'. For EMOs, however, these efforts have not led to a strong re-evaluation of the role of the EESC, which remains a side-player in the institutional set-up.

It is also important to note that the attempt of the EESC to strengthen links with EMOs is not particularly well received among the EMOs in the three sectors analysed.

The EESC, for instance, has set up a Liaison Group to coordinate action with EMOs. However, big EMOs often have decided not to join the Liaison Group.

For the regionalist sector, the marginalisation of the EESC in the interest of EMOs is even bigger: regional EMOs have no contacts with the EESC and focus their attention on the

Committee of the Regions. In other sectors EMOs may appreciate some of the work done by the EESC, such as for instance environmental EMOs appreciating the EESC's work on GMOs, but there remains scepticism about the composition and lack of influence of the EESC.

The perception by institutional actors, though, need not to be so negative. Several institutional representatives interviewed mentioned that the EESC can deliver very valid opinions and extra expertise on certain issues, and that it has recently improved in expertise.

Committee of the Regions

The Committee of the Regions appears as an obvious central access point for regional EMOs, which define it as 'our natural home'. However, while the COR may appear an obvious ally, the EMO representatives also point to its institutional limitations, as one EMO representative called it even 'a talking shop that is not listened to'.

For environmental EMOs, the COR is an unclear 'target' of lobbying, mainly because of its merely advisory status, but also because the diverse interests of regions in relation to environmental issues do not facilitate the definition of a clear strategy towards this body.

EMOs in the anti-racist sector note that regions are becoming more central in regulating migratory and anti-discrimination issues, but at the moment they still play a secondary role and therefore do not attract significant attention of organised civil society. Contacts between the COR and anti-racism EMOs are limited to little more than sharing information through mailing lists.

European agencies

In all sectors in this research, agencies exist or are at least proposed. In the regionalism sector, there is still no agency but a proposal has been made for the creation of a linguistic diversity agency. Interesting in this debate is that civil society organisations were consulted on the form of such agency, and that the consultation process manifested a preference for the creation of such an agency rather than delegating more tasks to EMOs while providing them more funding.

Also in the sector of anti-racism there has been recently a consultation process of civil society organisations in relation to the reform of the European Monitoring Centre on Racism into an agency on fundamental rights. Anti-racist organisations are very concerned that with the re-definition of the role of the agency the centrality of the race-

related agenda be maintained, but also that the involvement of civil society be retained and enhanced.

Most satisfaction seems to be expressed in the environmental sector in relation to the environmental agency, which is positively assessed by EMOs both in its role and in access to the agency.

Much more criticised is the relationship with the European Food Safety Authority. The EFSA had to overcome the criticism on opaque committee governance that had characterised European food regulation. The aim is to distinguish between risk assessment (to be the task of EFSA) and risk management being the task of the Commission and comitology. EMOs criticise the latter to be as opaque as in the past. Regarding risk management through EFSA there is a principled opposition between EFSA and Commission on the one hand arguing expertise should be independent whereas environmental EMOs would prefer civil society participation also at this level. At a minimum, they argue, scientific evidence should be transparent.

Court action and European Ombudsman

Court action is mainly a national strategy, i.e. by national SMOs before national courts, even on European issues. EMOs may provide support to national SMOs for such action.

A main reason for this lack of legal action at European level is due to the very restrictive rules of standing before the European Court of Justice. Moreover, EMOs argue that the legal framework may not be strong enough for court action, and as an EMO representative stated 'probably it is not up to judges to decide on very political decisions such as GMOs'.

There are other arguments that are taken into account by EMOs whether to go or not for court action. If court action is chosen this is not that much for the individual case at hand, but because the court action may be strategically part of media campaigning. On the other hand, EMOs are aware that court action can be perceived as an 'aggressive strategy', as one risks to be perceived by the EU institutions as 'lacking fairplay'.

However, EMOs and institutional actors do not need necessarily to be on the opposite side in relation to court action. The Commission may very well be interested in having civil society actors playing a more active role in ensuring EU law through Court action. This happens, for instance, in the anti-racism sector where the Commission holds seminars and trains NGOs on how to bring cases to court in order to have implementation and interpretation of provisions of directives.

Given limits of protective standards, EMOs see court action more likely on procedural issues as transparency, on which they consider it easier to 'have the law on their side'.

Both environmental and regionalist EMOs have considered using the European Ombudsman on such procedural questions, whereas no action as been considered in this sense in the anti-racist sector.

Transparency and access to documents

Interviewed about the efforts undertaken by the European institutions to improve transparency, EMOs agreed in their positive assessment of it. They signal, though, also remaining problems. First of all the legalistic and technical nature of many documents is considered as a remaining barrier for openness to broader civil society.

Second, EMOs ask for scientific evidence to be public and open. In particular, they criticise the possibility of keeping documents confidential for reasons of the 'competitive position of firms' which is said to be too much used and too quickly accepted by the Commission according to the EMOs. Thirdly, the sheer quantity of paper produced becomes overwhelming for small organisations and can amount to a form of lack of transparency.

Evolution over time of political opportunity structures

European Institutions and in particular the European Commission have undertaken many initiatives over the last decade to improve interaction with civil society. Asked about the evolution over time, EMOs appear generally positive on their assessment of initiatives regarding transparency and openness, for which they see a general improvement.

However, there remains strong scepticism among EMOs on whether changes in consultation have led to any change of their influence on European policy-making.

Finally, it is argued that efforts by the Commission to improve openness, access and responsiveness are only one aspect of the picture. In particular changing policy contexts and priorities set at a more political level may block off any influence.

4.6.3. Representativity of EMOs

Representativity in terms of internal organisation

Organisational structures vary from organisation to organisation. EU recognised networks such as ENAR have solid democratic procedures for the election of national representatives. However, EMO secretariats are appointed and rules of leadership are not often democratic. Leaders are co-opted.

Regarding transparency, EMOs are generally easily accessible. Much of their policy research is put on the web and is easily distributed upon request. EMOs generally keep accurate minutes of their meetings and they document elections.

Representativity in terms of coverage, and national diversity versus common views

An important question regarding coverage is related to the enlargement of the EU. The interviewees in the Commission appeared less pessimistic on this issue than what is often argued in this respect. 'The big organisations have taken their measures in advance and do not have a problem. Most enlargement countries managed to be represented in most organisations. Within the anti-racism sector, though, there remain problems with the representation of minority groups in new and accession countries, for instance Russian speaking groups.'

Whether formal inclusion of national organisations in EMOs leads also to the active participation of the representatives of these countries remains under discussion. According to one Commission official 'experts from these countries in working groups or standing groups remain often silent, they are rather low profile.'. However, another Commission official thinks they do have the level of technical expertise, but they are not used to the way of functioning at the European level. Sometimes they have also a language problem, and there may also be a psychological aspect to it.

Another way to look at representativity is to see how an EMO represents on the one hand a common European interest of the organisations it is the emanation of, and on the other hand is able to express the national, regional and local differences of its member organisations without reducing it to 'the lowest common denominator'.

Many EMOs stress that the process of aggregating consensus is very time consuming and that this effort is not always entirely valued and appreciated by the EU institutions.

Given the limited time available for internal consultation, on several specific policy issues there simply is no time to consult national organisations and therefore the views expressed in Brussels are often the outcomes of decisions by Brussels-based staff, occasionally with the support of a round of phone calls. EMO representatives see this as inevitable and lament the fact that institutions do not give enough time for proper consultations of member organisations. The period allowed for feedback is nominally of eight weeks and even this period is reported to not be always available.

Institutional actors – particularly Commission officials – appear to consider issues of representativeness very important and report that in their evaluations of policy advice they examine EMOs relevance in terms of membership and their criteria for the aggregation of members' opinions. This clearly puts EMOs in a difficult position, being obliged to show good consultation practices without sufficient time and often resources to do so effectively.

EMOs present in Brussels provide, apart from a lot of information, the missing knowledge about the local context. In the context of trans-European networks, for instance, they alerted on environmental risks that the Commission in Brussels doesn't know about. Transport issues have always a clear territorial and often national dimension. EMOs will therefore often act at European level in relation to projects it has been informed on by one or several of its national member organisations. For instance, WWF Europe lobbied in Brussels to avoid that structural funds would be spent on the construction of the 'Ponte sul Stretto di Messina', the bridge that would link Sicily to the rest of Italy and would have a very important impact on the environment.

Interaction between the EMO and its member organisations, and the tension between on the one hand a common European position and on the other hand attention to local needs and problems, obviously differs according to the policy sector. While transport issues are by definition more 'territorialised', and thus involving particular local problems, this is less the case for GMO policy where the interests and problems of environmental organisations are strongly the same in the entire EU. The problem with transport is not that environmental organisations in Europe have very different interests in principle but that the problem is by definition more localised, which means that the EMO should take up the demands of the particular cases, whereas in the GMO issue the problematic is largely the same throughout Europe, independently of the territory.

According to the Commission officials interviewed, the European organisations seem mostly able to represent their national member organisations. Yet it is argued that some organisations are very big, in which cases compromises are more difficult and small

countries and small sectors may be a bit lost. A Commission official also notes that there is often relative initial consensus from civil society organisations but this fades as one delves more deeply into policy details. Another Commission official therefore concludes that the Commission aims to take this into account by listening in these cases also to smaller or national organisations. It is moreover perceived by the Commission that if European organisations do not work well internally, quite rapidly smaller organisations or individual industry will organise itself, and quite rapidly the Commission will get information from them.

Dependence on funding

Many EMOs complain about the too bureaucratic nature of procedures to obtain funding from the EU. EMOs complain about excessive administrative requirements to ensure accountability, and about an over bureaucratized and somewhat too literal assessment of quality in the deliverables. They argue that the institutions underestimate the amount of unpaid voluntary work involved, which is seen as contrasting with an excessively bureaucratic and inflexible working style of institutional actors. This being said, many EMOs depend to a great extent on European money.

One does observe different models of interaction according to whether EMOs get European funding or not. Organisations which get (much) European funding tend to be closer to policy orientations of the EU institutions. This does not automatically imply, though, that funding influences orientations of EMOs. Those EMOs which as a starting point have more common ground with policy orientations of the EU, may be ready to accept EU funding while others may not. In fact, from the point of view of EMOs, accepting or not accepting European funding often implies a principle choice.

From the point of view of the Commission, EU funding does not create dependence, although it is said that a minimum of 'fairplay' should exist in interactions with civil society organisations. This being said, Commission representatives said that even contesting organisations may be supportive in a DG's internal battle within the Commission. A functionary also stressed that the EMOs highly subsidised are also more carefully scrutinised in terms of representativity, members in all member states, involvement of national member organisations in their work etc. The general view of interviewed Commission staff on this issue is well formulated in the statement: EMOs 'are not grateful for the money they get, they are not shy in giving their opinion. They are very strong. So I don't see the problem.'

Given that EMOs have limited resources they have to be selective on the activities they can get involved in. Often they will have to choose between investing more in lobbying

activities or rather in campaigning and winning public support for their cause. Choosing for the first option, an EMO may not be representative in terms of activities in the way it would like to be. However, there is often a sort of tacit division of tasks among EMOs in a certain sector, which can be partially formalised by collaboration within the context of a European Platform organisation. This does not imply that the umbrella platform is considered as *the* representative forum in that sector. Nevertheless, one can argue that the total picture of civil society organisations within a certain sector – organised or not within a platform – may be rather representative in terms of ensuring the different roles of civil society organisations. Moreover, institutional actors argued that initiative in civil society is strong enough in the sense that where certain interests feel – no longer – represented in a certain civil society organisation, they soon find an opportunity to express their voice through another civil society organisation. Put differently, single civil society organisations may not appear entirely representative, but the total picture of organisations active at the European level is perceived by institutional actors as rather representative and flexible enough in adjusting to change.

EMOs as representative of civil society and criteria of representativity

While official EU documents have paid attention to the issue of representativity of civil society, the interviewed institutional actors do not always see this debate as particularly fruitful.

Several Commission officials interviewed, for instance, do not define the initiatives to improve consultation of civil society as a question of representation but as an issue of ensuring better regulation. If better regulation is the objective, any normative distinction between SMOs and other stakeholders seems difficult to justify and the issue of representativity becomes superfluous.

MEPs interviewed mentioned the different representative nature of EMOs in the regional sector compared to the environmental and the anti-racism sector, in that regional EMOs have also a political weight behind them. On the other hand, it is argued that it is less clear to identify what regional EMOs stand for, compared to environmental and anti-racism EMOs.

In general though, EMO representatives interviewed feel they are valued as a way of reaching out for an otherwise isolated bureaucracy or for MEPs who often feel less connected to their constituency than MPs. However, they also complain that EU institutions do not fully appreciate the work that EU-level civil society organisations carry out, for instance they stress that they have to spend much time in checking and

homogenising information and reports from member state organisations, a type of work that they think is not fully appreciated.

Views on representativity vary across organisations. EMO representatives tend to stress the importance of interaction with their national member organisations. Think-tank type organisations on the other hand play down the importance of representation, questioning whether representativity is at all a useful concept and expressing the view that it is necessary to move away from it. They argue it is better to concentrate on the contributions civil society can make rather than worrying about representation.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

The CIVGOV project addressed several interrelated bodies of literature. In reviewing its contributions it is useful to focus on the bodies of literature that were more central to its hypotheses: social movement research, research on interest groups, on civil society at the general theoretical level and on Europeanisation.

1. Advances on social movements' research

The literature on social movement research has proved useful on several accounts and our study has allowed a redefinition of some of its central concepts. Firstly, this literature has contributed the notion and the technique of *frame analysis*, which we utilised extensively to examine the ideological contents of the different groups we studied. Secondly, we utilised the literature on the *political opportunities of social movements* to analyse the interaction between the organisations we studied and the institutionalised political system. This literature is based on the assumption that social movements are challengers whose impact is determined by features of the overall system such as its openness, its propensity for repression and the cohesion of its alliances. Our findings indicate that it is misleading to thematise social movements as challengers. Rather they form stable alliances with organisations and actors of the institutionalised system against other components. For this reason the category of Movement Advocacy Coalition proved especially useful. This category is inspired by the work of Sabatier and others who postulated the concept of advocacy coalition, which will be discussed below. Thirdly, we addressed a literature on the *forms of inclusions* of movements and a literature on *repertoires*. Finally we addressed a recent literature on *Europeanisation* and on *Coalition Theory*.

We will very briefly list some of the main tenets of this varied literature and explain the advances made by CIVGOV.

1.1. Frame Analysis

Frame analysis indicates both a literature that stresses the importance of framing processes, that is, mechanisms to attribute salience to specific issues, and a technique that is used to identify key issues, and examine their relevance and change over time. Our work refined both the theoretical perspective and the technique. In the literature the technique is discussed in several key contributions (Snow, Rochford et al. 1986; Gamson 1992; Snow and Benford 1992; Johnston 1995). Our advances are described elsewhere and particularly in the methodological chapters of our Work Packages. Briefly we automated the analysis utilising a computer software (atlas.ti) and therefore improved

the reliability of the findings and enhanced the opportunities for cross-national and cross-sectoral comparison.

Framing as a theory of dynamics that singles out particular political contents and makes them relevant to public opinion or to the policy process emphasises mechanisms such as frame bridging, frame extension and frame change (Ruzza 2006). Frame bridging processes imply that civil society organisations and state institutions could share several ideological contents but often engage in processes of reframing in which ideological aspects that are considered important are connected to taken for granted assumptions in public discourse, thus creating frame bridges that attribute ideological legitimacy vis-à-vis public discourse. Our findings indicate that one area of frame bridging concerns the role of the state and an idealised conception of the role of civil society.

In studying cultural factors one has also to address the distinctive contribution of key historical events that have affected population attitudes. We have shown how the history and policy outcomes of each policy area have been shaped in different national contexts by key events. The impact of movement advocacy coalitions has thus been evaluated in terms of the policy debate that has taken place over time on controversial issues. For instance, we have underlined that threats to food safety such as mad cow disease were defined as policy crises by the media and had a facilitating role in the environmental policy of several countries. This helped the environmental coalition, which could exploit these issues in its communication strategies.

Accordingly, particular attention has been paid to groups' communication strategies: that is, how they choose to frame and attempt to re-frame issues. Attention was also paid to attempts by groups to persuade decision makers that they are popular. For their part, decision-makers were also shown to be active in this process of framing and re-framing, which they use to respond to any challenge against them, including those raised by the various components of advocacy coalitions.

The concept of frame and frame alignment proposed by Snow and colleagues, and the notion of consensus put forward by Klandermans (Klandermans 1988), facilitated the description of the nature of the alliance that develops among advocacy groups in specific policy areas and comes to constitute a MAC. Snow points out that a movement needs a 'master frame' that condenses the grievances of its members into a single concept. By means of a 'master frame' certain aspects of reality are identified and given prominence while others are omitted. Certain connections between elements are highlighted and others are ignored. For a social movement to achieve wider support, its master frame must resonate with the priorities of sectors of the general public. Movements attempt to

enhance this resonance by means of 'frame alignment' strategies whereby their frames become aligned with dominant cultural frames. This argument was verified in several fields: in anti-racism with the concept of mainstreaming and in environmentalism with the concept of environmental sustainability (Ruzza 2006).

These findings show that overall the three movement advocacy coalitions express policy discourse which is both compatible with the dominant neo-liberal policy discourse of European and often national institutions but which stresses some factors and underplays others. This then suggests a constructive role of organised civil society and specifically of its institutionalised social movement component. In particular, the 'neoliberal values' of European institutions and of several Member States are criticised and a more interventionist role for the state is advocated to redress what they perceive as a discrimination of peripheral locations and racial minorities into strengthened regulations against the neglect of the environment that they see as a consequence of a purely market-oriented approach.

In general terms, on the basis of these findings it can be argued that there are dominant and converging elements that allow one to define a European model of civil society involvement from which there are some deviations. This model is characterised by an overarching emphasis on participation which is actualised mainly in terms of a consultative role and an information-providing role. To a lesser extent there is evidence of a desire to include OCS in debates on the merits of proposing legislation in a dialogical role inspired by models of deliberative democracy. There is little evidence of a desire to include or requests to be included in autonomous unencumbered decision-making. In addition, a European model of civil society also includes an emphasis on its role in connecting different levels of governance and in relating to other non-state actors in horizontal governance structures.

Deviations from this model include the perspective of several OCS associations which emphasise a stronger state as guarantor of their inclusion in deliberative fora, and as guarantor of their role of providing representation of weaker social constituencies, and as provider of resources. Similarly, deviations from this model, but in the opposite direction, are expressed by institutional actors who dissent from any interventionist agenda to redress the imbalance between private and public associations, and occasionally from institutional actors (mainly in non-social policy roles) who dissent from any perspective that promotes the inclusion of non-state actors in policy-making.

1.2. Advances on POS perspectives

The Political Opportunities approach (POS) seeks to identify which political opportunities empower or restrict movements. It can therefore be used to shed light on the sources of the influence exerted by advocacy coalitions. The various strands of work on POS have reached substantial consensus on a set of key factors. For instance, McAdam (McAdam, McCarthy et al. 1996: 27) proposes a 'highly consensual list of dimensions of political opportunity' which consists of: the relative openness or closure of the institutionalised political system; the stability or instability of that broad set of elite alignments that typically undergird a policy; the presence or absence of elite allies; the state's capacity and propensity for repression.

These key concepts have been used by several authors to analyse the relations between movement and institutions¹⁴. And some of them have been usefully employed to examine the prospects for the movements of our case studies. At each territorial level, our inquiry focussed on which events, alliances and structural factors strengthen or weaken the impact of movement coalitions. Our work then contributed to a further understanding in the literature on the political opportunities of the three coalitions in the Member States examined. While a summary of POS in all the countries is not possible here for reasons of space¹⁵ (it is included in country reports and general overviews), some general points can be made.

We verified the scarce relevance of the POS variable 'repression'. The three coalitions are very or substantially institutionalised in all the countries and there are no repressive stances towards most of their action forms. An obvious exception are ethno-nationalist mobilisations which in countries such as the UK and Spain can be placed squarely in the protest politics camp. Anti-racism can also be supported by groups of the extreme left and attract repressive reactions by authorities.

With reference to other categories, we verified that alliance dynamics are crucial in the prospects of all the coalitions. Some examples will suffice. In Italy, the change of government in 2001 brought to power a very strong centre-right majority that needed no alliances to rule. This had rapid and substantial effects on the anti-racist coalition. Its

¹⁴ For a review of the literature on the institutionalisation of social movements see Seippel, O (2001) "From Mobilization to Institutionalization? The Case of Norwegian Environmentalism" *Acta-Sociologica*, 44, 21 123-137

¹⁵ For instance, with reference to the study of the comparative political opportunities of environmentalism see Giugni 2004 Giugni, M. (2004). Social protest and policy change: ecology, antinuclear, and peace movements in comparative perspective. Lanham, Md.; Oxford, Rowman & Littlefield.

research activities were no longer financed and its participatory fora were closed, such as the legislatively mandated fora for consultations with migrant associations.

1.3. Social movements and action repertoires

There is an important literature on the action repertoire of social movement organisations (Tilly 1978; Tilly 1979). This literature connects action repertoires on the one hand to repression and to calculations of strategic effectiveness in the social movement sector, and on the other hand to changes in lifestyles, symbolic codes, and routines of protesting populations. In the CIVGOV research we verified that the conventional social movement repertoire of recent years is gradually wearing out and becoming less appealing to social movement organisations, particularly when they are solidly entrenched in advocacy coalitions. This happens across the three policy sectors.

There are no relevant differences among sectors in terms of action repertoires: civil society organisations have a large repertoire of actions, and seek to address both institutions and the general public in order to bridge the gap between them. Organisations do not focus on a single form of action, but tend to employ a wide set of strategies, changing them according to contingent situations and the territorial level they are to address. The fact that the same organisations use a broad repertoire, sometimes privileging institutional forms, other times protest, indicates that the conventional clear differentiation between social movement organisations and interest groups is untenable. On the other hand, the choice of repertoires is not completely strategic as organisational routines, political mentalities and alliances play a role in the selection of repertoires.

1.4. Ritualisation versus policy effectiveness

There is a broad literature on the policy outcomes of social movements (see for instance: Banaszak 1996; Burstein, Eaton et al. 1997; Burstein 1998; Giugni, McAdam et al. 1999; Giugni 2004). Here one key dimension deserves special attention: real policy impact versus inconsequential inclusion. William Gamson examined this dimension. To the extent that the demands of a movement are acceptable to specific institutions, activists will tend to be accepted as participants in decision-making and movements' goals will be pursued even if modified by institutions. In CIVGOV the extent of activists' institutional acceptance was examined by consideration of their own reports and the reports of institutional actors as to their involvement in consultation, in negotiations, their formal recognition and inclusion. As for movements' achievements, the goals stated by activists in personal interviews and in documents was considered. The possible outcomes form a configuration of categories which were initially proposed by Gamson in his influential 'The Strategy of Social Protest', which examined a set of protesting groups (Gamson 1975).

Briefly, Gamson cross-referenced two sets of variables, noting that movements can be accepted or rejected by institutions, and that they can be successful or unsuccessful in producing one of four possible outcomes. These four outcomes can be categorised as follows: full response for accepted successful movements, co-option for accepted unsuccessful movements, pre-emption for non-accepted successful movements and collapse for non-accepted unsuccessful movements.

Gamson sought to determine the features shared by successful movement groups, identifying a set of variables that explained the outcomes of challenging groups. The variables he identified and examined were generally related to the unequivocal social movement character of the groups that he examined, that is, their role as disruptive forces and political challengers which does not similarly apply to advocacy coalitions. However, some of the variables that he examined are useful to review the outcomes of our research.¹⁶

Looking back at the CIVGOV country studies, their success can now be assessed in terms of the following two dimensions: the ability to achieve policy objectives; and the ability to gain recognition as a legitimate policy actor, i.e. as a source of valid policy ideas, and therefore be included in decision-making, but also the perception of being included without a real impact or of being excluded outright.

In general terms, the country studies show that the existence of consultations are appreciated but activists cast strong doubts as to their overall effectiveness.

1.5. MACs and coalition theory

Movements are not the only source of innovation. New policy ideas are produced and reflected by several other actors some of whom are at least in part sympathetic to movements. Then there are activists who hold positions of relative power and influence in the social and political system. And as Raschke has pointed out, the position of movement' participants in the social structure plays an important part in movement viability (Raschke 1985). It is also through them that movements gain institutional acceptance and can exert policy influence. The CIVGOV project validated this hypothesis in a number of contexts. To reach this finding, consideration was therefore given to the mechanisms that orient institutional housing of different social movements, the conflicts that arise when policy agendas are defined, and of the alliances made between movements and institutions.

¹⁶ It should be stressed that policy success refers to movements' goals, not to their organisations. Thus, a pre-empted movement will see its goals fulfilled but its organisations marginalised.

To address these concerns the CIVGOV project conceived the category of MACs. The analysis of their relevance and impact has been conducted with reference to institutions, but also (in Work Package 1) at the level of public discourse, articulating the impact between this level and decision-makers. The impact of movements is therefore on the one hand the result of institutional logics – which refer to their ideologies, taken for granted assumptions and organisational dynamics of institutional settings. These variables mediate the possibilities of movement allies to orient policy decisions. On the other hands, to have effective MACs it is necessary that movement organisations be able to collaborate and that a dialogue between movements and institutional settings develops. The CIVGOV project has identified the conditions under which this is likely to happen.

Thus, as mentioned, to understand the impact of social movements in institutionalised policy areas such as the ones we are studying, we have used the concept of advocacy coalition - a broader concept than that of social movement. It is through this concept that the conditions can be identified under which a dialogue can emerge.

The advocacy coalition framework perspective (ACF) is a theoretical approach based on some key concepts that we believe are particularly useful in studying institutionalised social movements and their relation to policy-making institutions. Four key principles of this perspective as developed by Sabatier (Sabatier 1998: 16) are:

- 1) that policy change and therefore the interaction between policy-makers and social movements has to be framed in historical terms, which is what this first set of reports attempted to do;
- 2) that a useful concept to be utilised in studying attempts to influence policy within policy fields is 'policy subsystem' in which the interaction of actors from different institutions is considered; contextually, and in addition that non-state actors such as those that we referred to as MACs are also considered;
- 3) that all levels of government be considered;
- 4) that public policies are essentially connected to belief systems.

There is also an important cultural component in policy-making activities. In this respect we have stressed the contribution of social movements to this cultural activity. The CIVGOV project allowed advances on all these dimensions.

To sum up, through an integration of concepts coming from social movement research and concepts coming from the advocacy coalition perspective we have stressed the

contribution of social movements to policy-making and the importance of historical and attitudinal factors in the way they exert their impact. We have produced a distinctive way to examining them, which is reflected in our national case studies and summarised in the country reports.

More specifically, we have identified mechanisms whereby MACs are operating on the basis of both resource considerations and ideological preferences. The interaction of these two variables was initially postulated in coalition theory. Coalition theory was originally formulated by William Gamson (Gamson 1961). Coalitions are instances of inter-sectoral action. Gamson focuses on four parameters in assessing their operation and chances of effectiveness: he first considers the initial distribution of resources – resources include motivation, information, prestige, contacts, authority derived from their size, wealth, etc. which are seen as related to actors' willingness to be involved. Then he stresses the importance of rewards participants expect from their involvement. So there must be a connection between participation and the appropriation of resources. This might include an amount of control on future decisions, which has however to be related to a perception that the coalition will be able to function. Then Gamson posits an important role for non-utilitarian preferences. This variable indicates the importance of ideological belonging, which moderates strategic considerations of resource appropriation.

We have verified the interaction between material and non-material considerations in several contexts. For instance at the EU level we have posited the category of institutional activists. They are members of EU institutions for whom the regulation of specific sectors, such as the environment or anti-racism brings both benefits related to bureaucratic politics (increased budget or bureau-shaping strategies) or symbolic benefits related to a documented personal history of previous activism in those sectors.

Our findings on the increased importance of coalitions square with the recent literature. Coalition theory has been utilised in a set of recent approaches to social movements. For instance Bystydzienski and Schacht (Bystydzienski and Schacht 2001) conceptualise coalitions as fluid aggregates of collective behaviour in which identities merge and activism interact with structural conditions to influence outcomes.

This approach is verified in our findings, which show the high identification and personal involvement of certain institutional actors in the goals of movements. At EU level, we showed for instance that former civil servants might be a member of organisations such as Amnesty International and share many of the goals of the social movements that lobbied the Commission. This leads researchers to formulate and use the concept of

'institutional activist'. We believe this concept constitute an importance advance in the literature as it undermines the opposition between movements and institutions that is implicit but central in POS theory.

The fact remains, however, that real collaboration between movements and institutions is difficult to achieve. There are several reasons that make it unlikely to emerge, and, as our findings show, when it emerges it might be more fruitful at levels other than the national one.

Table gives evidence of the little opportunities for sharing policy beliefs in all three sectors. There is generally at the national level a fairly low degree of common understanding between social movement activists and institutional actors.

Table 27. Levels of common understanding between activists and national institutions by sectors

Sector	High	Moderate	A little	Not at all	Total
Anti-Racism	10,8%	31,4%	37,3%	20,6%	100,0%
Environmentalism	2,8%	26,6%	34,9%	35,8%	100,0%
Regionalism	9,4%	32,8%	43,8%	14,1%	100,0%
Total	7,3%	29,8%	37,8%	25,1%	100,0%

A rather different picture emerges from results at the regional (and local) level, where higher levels of common understanding can be observed. This result confirms a broad trend in local governance. Indeed, the literature on local governance highlights the impact of partnerships on how policies are delivered, and that forms of collaboration among local authorities and local associations are well-established in all countries.

Table 28. Levels of common understanding between activists and regional institutions by sectors

Sector	High	Moderate	A little	Not at all	Total
Anti-Racism	18,3%	35,5%	38,7%	7,5%	100,0%
Environmentalism	7,4%	34,7%	35,8%	22,1%	100,0%
Regionalism	27,0%	45,9%	23,0%	4,1%	100,0%
Total	16,8%	38,2%	33,2%	11,8%	100,0%

1.6. Social movement Europeanisation

The CIVGOV project has addressed the literature on Europeanisation from an empirical standpoint. It provides a comparative framework in which many of the assumptions of this literature can be tested. For instance it demonstrated that European policies are perceived to be of central importance in the context of environmentalism and structural regionalism, while there are significant differences across countries in relation to the perceived relevance of EU regulations in the fields of anti-racism and of the protection of minority languages.

2. The literature on interest groups

The CIVGOV project addressed the literature on interest groups and suggested advances on several issues central to the literature. One aspect concerns the differences between private interest groups and other formations such as public interest groups and social movements. On this account we identified different alliance strategies and a different relationship to the public sphere.

Unlike private interest groups, the literature points out that social movement groups with differing degrees of institutionalisation more or less intentionally support each other, as the extreme ones attract media attention and are instrumental in agenda setting, and the institutionalised ones offer credible alternatives to the public and policy makers (Gamson, Fireman et al. 1982; Gamson 1988). Our project verified this assertion but showed the importance of selection filters that exclude certain movement groups from institutionalised settings, invalidating this theory and suggesting a revision. This was accomplished through the concept of the MAC.

Unlike epistemic communities, their range of views is wide enough to accommodate different causal beliefs and knowledge bases (Haas 1992: 18), and their moral/social conscience sustains commitment and high risk activities. Hence, social movements are

differentiated from pressure groups, given that the former can often use the ultimate weapon of substantially disrupting public order and can rely on the free donation of time and energy by activists (See Walker 1991: 187). They also often have sufficient social importance to attract substantial, albeit discontinuous, media coverage (Eyerman and Jamison 1991). Also to be stressed is their role in the creation of new constituencies and new knowledge in the policy process. Social movements perform a special role that derives from processes of identity creation that exceed the boundaries of public interest groups (Diani 1992:14). Thus, they may well encompass epistemic communities, but possible recourse to violence and generalised identity creation make them more influential and give a special power to NGOs active in a social movement. This constitutes an important advance over the literature on epistemic communities and advocacy coalitions as originally proposed by Sabatier.

3. Advances on the literature on civil society

Literature on civil society plays a central role in the context of the CIVGOV project. Such literature constitutes a growing area of attention in social sciences and in European studies more particularly. Important EU policy documents, the White Paper on Governance among the most relevant ones, refer to the inclusion of civil society as a distinctive feature of new forms of policy-making and as an effective way to overcome the democratic deficit of the Union. At the national level, a similar emphasis can be found in policy documents. It has been also stressed that the participation of civil society can prove useful in addressing the so-called crises of politics, that is the decreasing electoral turnout, the decreasing trust in conventional political actors, etc. An empirical and comparative study on the concrete modalities of such inclusion constituted a gap in the literature, and the CIVGOV project aimed at giving a contribution in this direction.

Our results suggest that in all three policy sectors civil society organisations have the general willingness to get included in policy processes. It is important to stress the relevance of such empirical evidence. First, it shows the overall acceptance of the idea that the inclusion of civil society in decision-making processes over public policy is a desirable development. This is in line with contemporary political discourse, which puts a strong emphasis on the idea that the involvement of civil society provides public authorities with highly valuable results and has to be encouraged at all territorial levels (Ruzza 2004). According to this view, thanks to the contribution of civil society, policy outputs are closer to citizens preferences, decisions are more likely to be effectively implemented, decisions have greater legitimacy both because they are more informed and take into account different points of view. It is of note that this is but one interpretation of the role of civil society. In the academic literature on civil society all

these functions of associationism have been interpreted in different ways, and are a matter for controversy (Warren 2001). It could also be noted that the inclusion of civil society is not the only way for bringing public preferences in policy processes. For instance, Ian Budge, in making the case for direct democracy observes that 'the new challenge of direct democracy lies in the startling fact that it is now technically possible. Public policy can be discussed and voted upon by everyone linked in a interactive communications net' (Budge, 1996:1). However direct forms of democracy have not been an option in the political debate, particularly at the EU level, where the expression 'participation of citizens' can be equated with 'participation of associations of citizens' (Nentwich 1998)

In a neo-Tocquevillian perspective, civil society is mainly about the development of ties among citizens (usually in small communities) and can be understood as the 'school of democracy.' The Tocquevillian framework lies at the heart of Putnam's influential work on associationism, and stresses that high levels of participation in associations can help building social capital and trust among citizens and consequently good institutional performances.

In a rather different tradition linked to liberal thought, civil society has been understood as the guardian of liberties against the power of states and its intrusion into the private lives of citizens (Gellner 1994). The debate in Eastern Europe on civil society and its merits in acting as a counterpoint to communist regimes mainly relied on such a liberal conception of associationism and emphasises the role of civil society in freeing citizens' opportunities for independent action.

In both perspectives the systematic inclusion of associations in collective decision-making is neither foreseen nor desirable. Nor is it present in a Habermasian concept of civil society, where associations are supposed to articulate a vibrant public sphere. To put it briefly, establishing connections between civil society and the political system in order to inform policy processes is not the usual way of thinking about the role of associations in political life.

However the literature also lists a number of advantages that derive from the inclusion of civil society in political processes. Engagement in dialogue with civil society is seen as a viable way to enhance public participation in the context of decreasing level of trust in political institutions (Pharr and Putnam 2000); for supplementing political parties in informing debates and aggregating preferences (Budge 2000); and for taking into account the increased cultural and ethnic differentiation of European countries. Civil society organisations should also be involved in implementation of public policies as

public authorities are no longer able to deliver public services that match the need of an increasingly differentiated population (Hirst 1997). At the EU level the participation of civil society is said to be a useful way of addressing the perceived democratic deficit of the Union, and in this context organisations would be required to act as agents of political socialisation (Warleigh 2001).

We argue that a substantial agreement between institutional and social actors has taken place, leading to the construction of a shared understanding about the desirability and democratic feasibility of getting civil society included in policy processes. This is not to say that institutional and social actors agree on the methods, purposes and expected outcomes of such inclusion. Disagreements over the competences, the responsibilities and the ability to achieve results are persistent. Nonetheless, in our sample the opposition to the idea of blurring boundaries between the political and the social appears to be marginal.

Secondly, the affirmed willingness to take part in policy processes tells us something about the perspectives of such vision. It is of note that in the context of reflections on participatory democracy, the concrete willingness of citizens to take part in political processes has constantly represented an open question. In the 1970s, Carole Pateman noted that theorists are forced to assume that citizens would participate if they only had the opportunity to do so, but that there is no empirical evidence regarding such a statement (Pateman 1970). In other words, even if we can find very strong theoretical and political motivations for adopting a participatory approach to policy-making, will it work in practice? We can briefly recall that there are valid counterarguments to the idea that participation is always advantageous: it is time consuming (Dahl 1989) and highly demanding in terms of information and skills to be acquired. In addition, it should also be noted that 'discussing' might not always be the best way for taking decisions, and that negotiations and voting are legitimate alternative methods (Offe 1987). Our results suggest that, where available, activists tend to utilise the institutional channels for participation, and that participation represents an important experience for sharing policy beliefs and for achieving a better understanding of the policy sector. However activists share a critical view on the willingness of elected officials and civil servants to be really inclusive and to take on board their positions. To put it briefly: participation is appreciated but it is also perceived to be ineffective. In particular, participation in consultation processes and public hearings represents a valid practice, but it does not allow a gaining of influence over policy processes and it is intended as complementary to lobbying activities.

Formal and informal relationships between social and institutional actors are of central importance here: our results suggest that a stable network based on a shared understanding of a policy issue, that is the formation of an advocacy coalition, represents an effective strategy for gaining influence over policy processes at all territorial levels. This is partially confirmed by the importance of personal relationships with institutional actors for achieving access. Institutional actors with a strong personal commitment to a particular issue are precious interlocutors for social movement organisations. In our interviews at all territorial levels we found evidence of the importance of personal and informal contacts with civil servants and politicians.

From a normative point of view, the central importance of the 'informal' dynamic leaves open questions about the identification of political responsibility over collective decisions and about the transparency of the decision-making process. For public control over binding decisions to be effective, in other words for a democracy to work properly, it should be always possible to identify who is entitled to be involved in discussions, to take decisions and to implement them. In this sense the transparency of the decision-making process is a basic requirement of any democratic system, and it is an unresolved issue in the context of reflections on new forms of governance. The results from the CIVGOV project shed light on these aspects, putting them in context. Indeed perceptions about the overall transparency of political systems (at local, national and EU levels) are differentiated across Europe, and it is not possible (nor useful) to delineate a unequivocal and simple conclusion on that. On the one hand perceptions are grounded in different local and national political cultures about the role of public authorities, civil society and expectations linked to their performance. On the other hand empirical evidences about the precise processes of consultation that takes place in different countries and in different sectors converge in showing the high degree of differentiation of institutional arrangements for the inclusion of civil society that have been implemented. The institutionalisation of the role of civil society organisations in policy processes is consequently a sensitive aspect of contemporary developments in collective decision-making, and the CIVGOV project helped in advancing knowledge on the topic. Literature on the inclusion of associations in deliberative settings has a prevalent normative orientation, and the concrete modalities for getting civil society included have been rather neglected. The collection of examples gathered by the CIVGOV team constitutes an important source of information on actual developments in the field.

In very general terms it is worth noting that the overall impact of such participatory processes is weak. The role played by organised civil society engaged in participatory policy processes tends to be marginal vis-à-vis the importance of representative institutions in determining both the agenda and policy outputs. Partially this comes from

the uncertainty about the legitimacy of participatory devices. As Cohen pointed out in the context of reflections on deliberative democracy, deliberation needs to be institutionalised to be effective, leading to a change in how collective decision-making is structured (Cohen 1989). In particular the transformation of the outputs of deliberative forums or consultation processes in binding collective decisions is a very sensitive issue, which is somehow neglected in theoretical reflections on deliberative democracy. As Gould points out, '... presumably because of Habermas's separation of communicative discourse from decision-making, these discursive interpretations of democracy focus exclusively on participation as talk or discussion or deliberation. In effect, it becomes all talk and no action, in the sense of effective decision-making. We may say that while decision without deliberation is blind, deliberation without decision is empty' (Gould, 1996:176).

In addition to this, civil society organisations are supposed to socialise citizens to new complex political processes, making them more aware of both opportunities and constraints to political authorities. In the present system of multilevel governance political authorities are expected to deliver efficient solutions to issues that are only partially under their control. In this sense, the socialising effect of civil society can help political authorities in making citizens less demanding and more aware of existing limits in resources. In our interviews with institutional actors we found that high public expectations are a serious issue to be addressed and that participatory devices can help in providing people with information about real opportunities for delivering policy solutions. In this sense, the main benefit expected by institutional actors in dealing with civil society organisations consists of sharing information and (to some extent) responsibility over public services. At the European level, the socialising function of civil society can help EU institutions in overcoming its remoteness, diffusing information about initiatives and results. Our results suggest that such educational or socialising functions have been taken on board by a minority of organisations included in our sample.

On the whole the CIVGOV results give evidence of the diffusion of the particular conception of civil society that has been proposed in political discourse from the 1090s onwards. At the same time, our results show the degree of complexity that the implementation of the agenda on civil society led to in different policy sectors, and the on-going process of institutionalization of the role of associations in a changing policy process.

4. Policy recommendations

The following propositions reflect a set of discussions that took place among CIVGOV partners on how to improve the impact of organised civil society in member states and at the EU level. Here we will more specifically concentrate at the EU level. Policy recommendations for specific member states are somewhat different in different states according to state structures, historical practices of group involvement and sectoral variables. But some general points can be made that are of more overall relevance.

We will start by addressing some general issues and questions that often arise in defining the role of civil society:

4.1. Should Civil Society organisations have stronger decision-making and/or consultative roles?

Our results indicate that civil society organisations (at both the national and supranational levels) wish to have a generally greater role in decision-making, and that their being still too far outside these processes at the EU level contributes greatly to the scepticism with which many of them regard the EU and its mission. However, increasing their decision-making role is only acceptable to the extent that they can show democratic credentials. In the language of EU policy documents, they need to prove their accountability, internal democracy, broad pan-European base and good mechanisms of internal consultation. Thus only associations that display these characteristics should be included in formal advisory roles. Other associations, such as think-tank type organisations however need to be included in consultative roles. They can provide innovative perspectives to the policy process even if they are not accountable and internally democratic.

4.2. Support for capacity building: how to allocate resources?

Perhaps the most crucial need expressed by the civil society organisations that we interviewed was financial resources – preferably resources that would not be threatened by effective organising and advocacy. One way the shortage of resources expresses itself is in too few staff with training and/or experience that is insufficient to the challenges they face. Once again, this is an especially significant challenge in anti-racist work. The key concept here is capacity building – building a cadre of staff and first and second tier leadership with training in a variety of organisational and campaign oriented skills. These would include such areas as recruiting strategies, how to work effectively with the news media, political strategies, effectively combating the arguments of extreme groups such as ethno-nationalist parties, ways of getting people engaged, and developing national

and international networks to support and learn from one another. Where national or locally based organisations have been especially effective and/or successful, that success could and should be drawn on in providing such training.

Resources should be aimed at addressing different needs. Resources are needed to employ already trained personnel such as lawyers and accountants that can spread knowledge and good practice in civil society organisations. Resources are needed to improve organisations' ability to interact with the media. Resources are needed to improve organisational ability to liaise across territorial levels.

An important decision concerns whether resources should mainly be directed to EU level networks or distributed more broadly. Our research shows that concentrating on EU level umbrella groups is only efficient after an authentic process of aggregation of views and preferences has begun to emerge in the field. In the early stages, in several policy areas it is useful to distribute resources more widely and emphasise co-founding arrangements that motivate organisations to acquire a real and functioning base in member states' civil societies.

Some general suggestions on the allocation of resources can be made:

- More resources for civil society to run sensitisation campaigns, develop capacity to bring organisations together (umbrellas)
- Resources to reflect national priorities (should not be conditioned on EU-wide generalisations)
- Resources to organised civil society in order to monitor enforcement of codes of conduct on political discourse (already existing) and media discourse

4.3. Problems with 'Brussels' relocation of organised civil society

Inevitable tensions arise between groups at national and umbrella groups at the EU level. These might be managed by 1) focusing on capacity building activities that *emphasise developing and strengthening multiple linkages* –between national organisations in different countries, between national and EU level organisations, and also between national organisations and EU institutions.

Top down capacity building – in which European NGOs recruit from among their member/constituency organisations and carry out training etc, and

Bottom up capacity building – in which national level NGOs collaborate (either within a country, between them, or both) and request that EU level umbrella organisations assist them in developing such training activities.

Expanding the kinds of capacity-building activities that groups such as ECAS, EEB and others are engaged in could help put these and other organisations in a much better position to have an impact on policy substance.

Several interviewees point out that:

- there has been a significant amount of money available through the administration for capacity building work. However, it is not clear to what extent it is producing lasting organisational capacity;
- more attention needs to be paid to capacity building connected with the regional funds – capacity to participate in activities related to funds, to monitoring committees, dealing with complicated policies, etc.;
- there should probably be more engagement/involvement in hard issues – economic issues, rather than or in addition to the soft issues (consultation with environmental NGOs on the REACH proposals is perhaps an exception to this);
- progress in more abstract areas of ‘representation’ and ‘democracy’ is generally gained by work on very concrete and immediate issues;
- the key issue is not necessarily the EU level, but how it connects nationally and regionally;
- it would be useful to do some evaluation of how resources intended for capacity building activities might be more effectively targeted. This might involve engaging NGOs to participate in some form in such an evaluation.

The EU level relocation of civil society organisations needs to be aided by EU information campaigns and other initiatives specifically directed at civil society organisations.

We observed a misunderstanding of EU policies by civil society generally and a misperception of the EU’s role in relevant policy sectors. This could usefully be addressed by the Commission in the context of collaboratively organised conferences and training seminars.

4.4. Further recommendations

4.4.1. Make accounting more public

There are already many systems of reporting, evaluating and accounting in place in connection to the implementation of EU directives both in the formal sense (of adopting national legislation) and the practical sense (of actually implementing measures that produce the desired effects). These are however, not nearly as visible as they might be. Organised civil society could have a much more active role in such accounting – both in reporting in their own evaluations of the performance of their home country, and also in publicising that performance in the national news media (both in an absolute sense, and in comparison with other member states). Such evaluations and rankings would also need to be constructed with some measure of care, especially in countries such as Sweden with a high level of ambivalence toward the EU, but this could certainly be done and tailored to the conditions in each country. One almost obvious point is that recognition and ranking systems would be best constructed around the widely accepted societal goals that the directives, recommendations, etc address themselves to – not to how well the individual country follows EU demands. It might be strategically helpful to place certain kinds of accountability mechanisms or programmes in European level NGOs in order to defuse arguments of the Commission interfering in national political issues where it has a limited mandate.

4.4.2. Implementation of EU legislation

The implementation of the anti-racist directive provides an excellent example of how the EU can improve the involvement of civil society organisations in monitoring legislation and policy developments at the national level. Member states which previously had no such mechanisms were obliged to set up anti-discrimination agencies and involve civil society in monitoring policy. The involvement of civil society in monitoring policy implementation at the national level is a principle that could be extended across all EU policies involving national level implementation, although certain criteria would need to be met by civil society organisations and other relevant interest groups and stakeholders as to their level of representativeness, knowledge and relevance to the policy sector.

4.4.3. Regarding the Policy Sectors

1) Environment

EU political structures are still observed as situated far away, as something complex and difficult to assess by many grass-roots environmental groups. The EU institutional framework is formed by a complicated bureaucracy, a complex itinerary of policy making

with difficulties in achieving inputs. This means that national EMOs must dedicate significant administrative and financial resources to this task. To be active at the EU level means obtaining professional staff for this special role, which many local groups, regardless of their interest, could not afford. Thus further resources for capacity building and training in communication and dealing with the EU would be desirable.

Despite the difficulties and troubles that national environmental organisations must overcome to arrive in Brussels and make contact with a European umbrella, or single big environmental organisation or even with the EU institutions, most of the EMO representatives agree that the EU level action is very important, basically because 80% of environmental legislation proceeds from there and in a short time must be transposed into national law. Thus EU environmental leadership needs to be maintained, and information on the EU's role and importance needs to be made more widespread.

GMOs: The introduction of GMOs in Europe is characterised by the conceptual complexity of the subject in question and the difficulty faced by citizens in general in forming a clear opinion on such an intricate and complex topic. This recalls the start of the debate over nuclear energy in the 1960s and 1970s, when the companies involved in its development argued that this was a new technology about which only persons with scientific preparation could give an opinion. Thus further support for information campaigns and meetings in which knowledge and understanding can be developed would be desirable.

The areas that have witnessed confrontations and campaigns over GMOs have been those of food, agriculture and science. The food scandals (dioxins, mad cows, etc.) that have affected Europe in the last decade have led anti-GMO groups to demand proof of its harmlessness for human consumption. Secondly, the controversy over transgenics has made itself felt in European agricultural policy. The agricultural sectors critical of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) are voicing their opposition to the introduction of these crops because of the increase in food insecurity. In a third field, although we find scientists and studies that hold positions for and against, the transnational companies have been repeatedly denounced for putting pressure on universities and scientists to follow their script in the debate on GMOs. Facing those who argue that opinions can be offered and positions adopted only on the basis of solid scientific positions (the techno-scientific vision), there are those who argue that science is not neutral and that these new technologies, in spite of the serious risks they entail, are being supported by positions of social and economic power (the critical vision). Thus it is important to maintain the precautionary principle and not be swayed by the weight of economic interests.

Transport: Mobility and sustainable transport have become a new political objective for the majority of the governments of the EU, which have been witness to the serious social, environmental and economic impact of the increase of motorisation, which is seemingly unstoppable and constantly requires new infrastructure, forming a vicious circle. The EU has played a key role here in supporting and financing infrastructure projects. The EU needs to maintain and further develop its consultations with civil society organisations on the ground when assessing the impact of such projects.

Civil society mobilisations can be differentiated in terms of the reactive course against airports, new road infrastructure and high speed train links etc and the pro-active course, which seeks agreement and a conjunction of interests amongst the numerous social actors involved in transport (users and transport sector workers, local authorities, businessmen, ecologists, residents of affected areas) and that tries to promote new forms of mobility with less impact (non-motorised mobility, bicycle and pedestrian lanes, public transport, intermodality, car-free neighbourhoods, road safety education), generating examples that provide an alternative to conventional transport. Greater resources need to be provided for developing the latter, and also improving information as to its benefits.

2) Regional Policy

Given the variety of complaints, SMOs call for different EU policy solutions. Many SMOs call for more specific EU programmes for national minorities, and the 'Spanish' SMOs even call for full recognition of regional languages as official EU languages. There is a general concern about the current funding of the EBLUL. Some call for a direct representation of the regions in the EU institutional framework ('Europe of the Regions' or 'Europe of the Peoples'). Others call for making the Charter of the Council of Europe binding for old member states (and not just the new). Generally, there is the hope that European integration may offer an opportunity to accommodation and more consociational management of minority affairs.

In nearly all cases, learning the minority language at schools is considered as a main challenge and necessity, and the place par excellence to work at the maintenance of the language. Another common sphere of promotion of the minority language is the economic sector, which seems to be slow in adapting to the expansion of the minority language into a hegemonic language. Thus promotion of language learning should remain the EU's main policy concern on the condition that it also includes minority languages. This involves benefiting even from affirmative action, given the problems of maintenance of many of these small languages. The disappearance of these would clash with the EU's

objective for promoting cultural and linguistic diversity. Special attention should be given to the use of the minority languages in economic exchange, where EU regulations are considered a threat (e.g. the policy regarding labelling only in main languages).

Some minorities try to improve their image and that of minorities by presenting themselves as exemplary citizens who speak several languages and are not focused on a single culture and nation-state. These consider themselves as new multicultural European citizens (like the Danish in Germany) as opposed to the majority of mono-cultural, old fashioned nation-statist 'nationals.' Thus EU policies directed specifically towards multilingualism may favour minority language speakers if the knowledge of these minority languages were to be recognised on equal footing as the knowledge of official EU languages.

A common reproach of the European Commission is that its functioning is too bureaucratic, opaque and tight in terms of funding. This attitude disables especially smaller SMOs and minority language communities from getting funding. There is a general complaint about the problems of access to the EU for most of the regional SMOs, which consider themselves too small, poor, understaffed, uninformed and inexperienced to interact effectively with the European Commission. Hence, different EU institutions should invest in transparency, simplification of application and implementation, more information, openness to small communities and SMOs and more generous funding.

EBLUL is clearly the most relevant European level SMO for the minority language field, generally evaluated positively in terms of representativeness, access to the EU, dissemination of information, networking and learning opportunities, awareness-raising of public opinion and legitimation of minority demands. Thus the EU should expand and provide sustainable funding of EBLUL and other representative organisations for the defence of linguistic minorities such as FUEN.

Support from minority MEPs is perceived to be lukewarm and seems to depend on individuals' goodwill. The European Council and the Committee of the Regions are hardly ever mentioned. Hence, different EU institutions should invest in awareness raising among their members regarding the problems of minority languages, in particular the EP and the CoR.

The recent wave of enlargement countries have been pushed to adopt measures¹⁷ regarding minority protection as part of the practice and rhetoric of the *acquis*

¹⁷ The European Commission's communication regarding the 'European Union's Role in Promoting Human Rights and Democratisation in Third Countries,'

communautaire. As for the EU15 member states they were considered to respect their minorities by default, while they often did not (e.g. France, Greece, and to some extent Belgium). Hence, contestation of minority rights in the enlargement countries may carry unintended long-term effects in the accession countries, i.e. feedback of external minority policies into the internal EU system. In several states, the Charter on the protection of minority rights has become the standard of good practice and has even involved the Council of Europe in the evaluation of the Charter's implementation process (UK). In the long run, the EU should push some of the EU15 countries to 're-import' and genuinely implement the minority protection conditions they have imposed on the enlargement countries. The effect of this would be the integration of the convention on minority languages into the *acquis communautaire* and the verification of its implementation also in old member states.

The recent enlargement of the EU including very small nation-states with a hegemonic 'minority' language (Maltese, Latvian, Lithuanian, Estonian, Czech, Slovak, Slovenian) is seen as an opportunity for many nations without a state. In fact, there is the growing contradiction between the absence of institutional recognition of large regions, such as Catalonia, Scotland, and Flanders and the full recognition of these small nation-states. The minority parties argue that if the only guarantee for political existence at the European level is 'stateness', the only possibility given to stateless nations to be recognised at the European level will be the option of becoming an independent state within the framework of the European Union. Hence, in order to avoid independentist strategies, the EU and its member states are expected to institutionally give the regions a voice in the EU constitutional framework.

The same contradiction exists regarding the full recognition of the languages of the small new member states, and the refusal to recognise the official language of large regions spoken by millions of EU-citizens (e.g. Catalan). The new small nations with state are expected to be more sensitive to questions of the survival of cultural small communities, for instance regarding the use of minority languages as the official EU-language and EU-policies regarding liberalising the cultural communication markets. The EU should move towards recognition, which also may enhance the status of minority languages within their own state.

In the sector of structural funds it is important that the public is more aware of the issue and the involvement of the EU. Furthermore, regional institutions should involve civil society more often. Involvement in Monitoring Committees should be made more uniform and give the civil society organisations more possibilities to have an actual say in the

issue and to not be a mere instrument for democratic legitimisation. Concluding, the Committee of the Regions should get a larger role, making the regions more influential.

3) Anti-Racism

The key problem highlighted by anti-racist organisations of nearly every type, is the lack of resources to run campaigns and perform effectively. This causes particular problems due to the low level of public opinion support perceived by anti-racist organisations. Thus a key objective is to seek more resources for civil society organisations to run sensitisation campaigns and also to develop the capacity to bring organisations together and organise campaigns locally/nationally

Most local organisations do not seek to engage directly with the EU, and are more preoccupied with events on the ground. Only a few national level organisations seek to engage with the EU level, usually through EU level networks (notably ENAR). However, a concern with these networks was that resources channelled through them often tended to reflect priorities decided at the EU level. Often these priorities do not reflect national priorities (e.g. problems related to treatment of Roma may be more relevant in one country and not another). Thus it is proposed that resources coming from the EU should better reflect national priorities (and should not be conditioned on EU-wide generalisations)

Moreover, another problem raised was the contradiction between the EU immigration and asylum policy and the general focus on security concerns, and anti-racist principles. Thus a greater attention on the part of EU leaders, and politicians and officials working in the immigration/asylum field was required as regards EU anti-racism mainstreaming principles. Moreover, while DG social affairs had good communications with anti-racist organisations, the JLS DG needs to involve anti-racist civil society representatives more broadly in consultations. A more holistic approach involving both 'immigrant' and 'anti-racist' organisations in consultations in issues under the ambit of both DG social affairs and DG JLS is a proposal that emerges here.

Another complaint that emerged in the research was that even where consultation took place, this was not translated into policy-making. Thus, consultation – particularly at the national level – was seen as symbolic window-dressing, used for legitimising purposes. Thus a suggestion that emerges from this is that the involvement of civil society in policy-making needs to go beyond the symbolic – the views of civil society organisations need to also be duly considered - especially at the national level. This is a suggestion that can apply across all policy areas.

As already mentioned, the anti-racist directive had facilitated a greater role for national level civil society organisations in monitoring national anti-racist policy, through their involvement in the bodies set up under the directive to enforce anti-discrimination principles. In general, the involvement of civil society organisations in the monitoring of all anti-racist policies at the EU, national and sub-national level emerges as an important policy objective. This should also apply to other policy areas that impinge on race relations, such as immigration and asylum policies and policing and security policy.

It was noted in some member states that the national anti-discrimination bodies set up in implementing the anti-racist directive did not always comply with the stipulations of the directive, for example in ensuring independence from political institutions and a proper civil society role in monitoring. Thus, greater efforts were required here by policy-makers to ensure proper implementation.

Civil society organisations often lamented that they did not have the resources to legally challenge the violation or non-implementation of anti-racist principles, even when legislation was in place to protect to safeguard these principles. Thus the provision of better resources to aid legal challenges on the part of specialist anti-discrimination organisations would be a desirable policy recommendation.

One symbolic recommendation would be the provision of annual awards (with some financial or in-kind resources attached) to be granted to SMO/NGO organisations seen as contributing most in Europe to combating racism and building solidarity across borders. The top pick could come, for example, from among nominations from each country. In addition to recognition and symbolic support for the work being done, such awards could serve as an element in promoting EU networking, and highlight especially effective approaches/strategies/campaigns.

The decline or general poor level of standards of discourse among political and media actors when discussing matters related to race, ethnicity and migrants was lamented. Thus the better enforcement of codes of conduct on political discourse (such as those already existing under Council of Europe auspices) and media discourse need to be encouraged by the EU and policy-makers in general and applied at all levels of governance.

5. The collaborative effort of the CIVGOV project

CIVGOV represented a very ambitious project, involving 12 academic teams in 10 countries across Europe. The CIVGOV team included scholars who have different backgrounds: political science, sociology, law. This proved both an opportunity and a challenge. On the one hand, multidisciplinary constitutes an important opportunity for addressing a particular topic from different points of view, leading to a more complete understanding of the phenomenon. This is particularly true for new research fields, where the exploratory and the descriptive stages of research are of great value and play a decisive role in shedding light on actual circumstances. It is of note that comparative research on the role of associations in local, national and European policy-making was lacking before the CIVGOV project started. In this sense, our project provides a map of expectations, interpretations, and functions of civil society organisations in three policy sectors that constitutes an original contribution to the state of the art of different disciplines. Differences in theoretical backgrounds among scholars involved in the project helped to widen the range of topics to be addressed.

In addition to differences in theoretical backgrounds, nationality played a role in enriching the possible interpretations of the role of civil society and of the framing activities of social movement organisations. In this light the extensive plan of interviews at the local and national levels proved essential in giving a sense of what perceptions and expectations of European governance are among locally and nationally-based associations. Different views of what anti-racism is about, of the concrete meaning of sustainable development or of the subsidiarity principle emerged from the cross-national comparison, and have been made possible by the intensive sharing of information among CIVGOV researchers.

As noted, the internal differentiation of backgrounds also constituted a challenge, leading to difficulties in terms of overall and scientific coordination. This is particularly true in relation to methodological issues. At the beginning of the research quantitative/qualitative preferences constituted a clear divide between researchers. On the one hand the need for cross-national and cross-sectoral comparisons prioritised the adoption of a quantitative approach; on the other hand the need for an in-depth understanding of the role of associations required gathering qualitative information. In this light differences in background have been essential in leading to a methodology based on an original combination of qualitative and quantitative methods.

6. Future need for research

The CIVGOV project addressed a wide number of complex issues in the field of social movement organisations, associationism and interest intermediation, shedding light on practices of participation and representation of citizens' concern at different territorial levels. From this point of view, the main findings of the project focus on the extreme fragmentation of experiences that can be found across European countries and in different policy sectors. On the whole, the role of civil society organisations appears highly differentiated, and as noted in previous paragraphs such differences depends on political opportunities, characteristics of political culture as well as personal relationships between activists and institutional actors. In this light the institutionalisation of the role of civil society in policy-making constitutes an open question. Further research is needed in order to better understanding such on-going processes, focussing on normative questions about legitimacy and accountability.

The CIVGOV project addressed very specific sub-issues, such as GMOs and mobilisation against the expansion at airports. A vast amount of information has been gathered on such issues, leading to a better understanding of the role of advocacy coalitions in establishing policy directions and in linking different territorial levels of governance. In this light, other policy sectors would be of interest, for instance rural development policy constitutes an important field where local, national and European actors interact to deliver policy results. Such policy fields represent a very interesting case study that would proves very useful for testing hypotheses on the functioning of the multi-level system of European governance.

V. DISSEMINATION AND EXPLOITATION OF RESULTS

1. Potential for Exploitation of Research

The activities of the Jean Monnet European Centre and the Department of Sociology and Social Research at the University of Trento in which the CIVGOV project co-ordination was housed provided a varied potential for exploitation of the research undertaken. The Jean Monnet European Centre held a regular series of (Jean Monnet) lectures, as well as frequent workshops and conferences and an annual summer school, often involving visiting professors from institutions in Europe and beyond. The topics covered in these events often touch on issues relating to the CIVGOV project, providing a valuable opportunity to exchange ideas and discuss results.

2. Relationship with other EU projects

XENOPHOB: Research on the CIVGOV project also related to research for another EU 5h framework programme project – XENOPHOB (on racism and xenophobia in the EU), co-ordinated by the University of Uppsala. This linked particularly well with the anti-racism sector of the CIVGOV project. Carlo Ruzza (CIVGOV scientific director, Partner 1: Trento) was the Italian partner on this project, and Stefano Fella (CIVGOV project manager, Partner 1: Trento) acted as research co-ordinator for the Italian XENOPHOB team. Tom Burns, the Swedish partner (partner?, Soderton Stockholm) on the CIVGOV project was a member of the XENOPHOB co-ordinating team at the University of Uppsals, as was Marcus Carson, the lead researcher for the Swedish CIVGOV partner.

CISONANCE: Stijn Smismans (CIVGOV coordination team, Partner 1: Trento) also works on the project CISONANCE, which compares civil society participation in the EU with such participation in the WTO. The project is more normative and institutionally focused than CIVGOV, taking deliberative democracy as a framework of analysis. Yet the two projects allow for interesting exchanges, in particular since CISONANCE takes food safety regulation as case study for analysing the institutional setting for participation; this creates interaction with the more sociological research of CIVGOV which takes GMOs as one of its sectors of analysis. CISONANCE is part of the Integrated Project NEWGOV, and Stijn Smismans has also been invited to interact on this basis with the CONNEX-network.

CONNEX: Hans-Joerg Trenz (CIVGOV partner 9) participates in the CONNEX Network of Excellence and participated at the CONNEX Conference 2005, in Mannheim. There it was decided that future sessions would be held on "Civil society and interest representation in EU-Governance". These sessions will be coordinated by Beate Kohler-Koch

The German team (partner 9) is also involved in a proposal for a future integrated research project under FP6. This project would study the normative aspects of European civil society in strengthening democracy at the European, national and local level.

CINEFOGO: Carlo Ruzza and Emanuela Bozzini (CIVGOV co-ordination team, Partner 1: Trento) are involved in the CINEFOGO Network of Excellence, which began in September 2005. The NoE CINEFOGO is intended to promote and disseminate scientific research on three main topics: Social Capital, the Voluntary Sector and Governance.

Carlo Ruzza is the general coordinator for the third area, and in this light the NoE constitutes an important opportunity for disseminating the results of the CIVGOV project widely and for discussing them with a larger audience. It is intended to do this by staging a number of workshops under the CINEFOGO auspices, in which the CIVGOV results can be discussed with other academics, whilst preparations are being prepared.

Non-EU projects: Carlo Ruzza and Emanuela Bozzini are involved in a project titled "The Role of Environmental Organisations in European Policies of Local Development", funded by the Italian Minister of Education and Academic Research (MIUR). The project focuses on the role of environmental organisations in the implementation of European rural policies, paying specific attention to the LEADER Initiative. The project will compare 12 case studies in Italy, France and the UK, to assess under which conditions environmentalists influence the agricultural policy community towards a sustainable model of farming. In this light the CIVGOV research on GMOs is of particular relevance.

Carlo Ruzza is also a partner in a project funded by the Volkswagen foundation entitled 'Giving new subjects a 'voice'. Other partners come from Canada and Germany. The overall co-ordinator is Prof. Patrizia Nanz of the University of Bremen. The other partners are Prof. Elmar Brähler of the University of Leipzig and Prof. Oliver Schmidtke of the University of Victoria (Canada). The project lasts from April 2005 to April 2008 and involves a comparative analysis of the treatment of immigrants in the health care system in Italy, Canada and Germany (particularly focusing on maternity and health care). This will be undertaken through the analysis of legislation, documents and surveys, together with focus groups and interviews. An analysis will also be undertaken of the policy networks that emerge in these fields. The aim of the project is to exchange and promote good practice in the field, making appropriate policy recommendations. The project has a degree of overlap with the anti-racist sector of CIVGOV and also the XENOPHOB project, with many of the organisations contacted and individuals interviewed for the fieldwork being the same.

3. Contacts with Potential Users

Contacts with various associations and organisations active in the field of environmental policy, anti-racism and regionalism at the local, regional and national level have been made in all the countries participating in the project in the course of the fieldwork for the CIVGOV project, given that this involves interviews with activists and other interested actors in each of these three policy fields. Similarly, the fieldwork also involved contacts with institutional actors at the local, regional and national level. Many of the civil society and institutional actors contacted and interviewed expressed an interest in receiving further information regarding the findings of the project in the future. At the consortium meeting held in Louvain in April 2004, activists from the three policy sectors covered by the project were invited for an exchange of views with the project partners. In particular, two representatives from the European Bureau of Lesser Used Languages gave a presentation of the organisation's work. In addition, Carlo Ruzza and Stefano Fella participated in a workshop of the Xenophob project in January 2005 hosted by the European Commission in Brussels, at which various policy-makers in matters related to civil society, and particularly anti-racism, were present. In November 2005, the CIVGOV Brussels workshop was staged, involving all CIVGOV partners. The results were presented to invited policy-makers, representatives of the Commission and civil society representatives (e.g. from the EEB, the Migration Policy Group, EBLUL, the Sami Parliament). The workshop provided an excellent opportunity for an exchange of views on the results and further contact with potential users.

4. Planned Project Dissemination Activities

Numerous publications are planned (or have already been produced) in order to disseminate the findings of the project. These include journal articles, book chapters, authored and edited books as well as conference papers (see Annex for list of publications/conference papers so far produced/forthcoming).

A first major exercise in disseminating the results of the CIVGOV project took place at the conference of the European Consortium of Political Research (ECPR) in Budapest from 8-10 September 2005, at which nearly all partners participated in a conference section on 'Governance and Civil Society in Europe' (organised by Carlo Ruzza and Lieven de Winter). This involved panels on the specific sectors (anti-racism chaired by Stefano Fella, environmental policy chaired by Inaki Barcena, linguistic/cultural regionalism chaired by Lieven de Winter, structural regionalism chaired by Simona Piattoni) as well as a cross-sectoral comparative panel (chaired by Carlo Ruzza), a general theoretical panel (chaired by Hans-Joerg Trenz), panels on the EU and transnational level of civil society

(chaired by Stijn Smismans) and panels on the local level and on gender aspects. These panels have acted as an initial staging post in shaping the main collaborative publications to come out of the project.

See http://www.essex.ac.uk/ECPR/events/generalconference/budapest/section_list.aspx

The programme for the section on 'Governance and Civil Society in Europe' (Section 11 of the 2005 ECPR Conference) included the following papers/interventions by members of the network:

Panel 2: Organised Civil Society and Linguistic and Cultural Minority Rights Protection

Chair: Lieven De Winter (Partner 6: Catholic University of Louvain)

Discussant: Peter Lynch (Partner 8: University of Stirling)

Papers:

Maciej Witkowski, Krzysztof Lecki and Kazimiera Wódz (Partner 11: University of Silesia): "*Organised Civil Society and Linguistic and Cultural Minority Rights Protection*"

Margarita Gómez-Reino; Mónica Ferrín; Josu Larrinaga; Martiño Rubal (Partners 14 and 2) University of Santiago de Compostela/University of the Basque Country): "*Spanish Civil Society and the protection of Basque, Catalan and Galician Languages in a Multilevel Space*"

Panel 4: Civil Society and Anti-Discrimination Policy: Anti-Racism

Chair: Stefano Fella (Partner 1: University of Trento)

Discussant: Hans-Jorg Trezn (Partner 9: Humboldt University, Berlin)

Papers:

Margarita Gómez-Reino, (Partner 14: University of Santiago de Compostela) "*Spain, European Civil Society and Antiracism*"

Huri Tursan, (Partner 6: Catholic University of Louvain): "*The Grey Book of Anti-Racism in Belgium*"

Kazimiera Wódz, Jacek Wódz, Maciej Witkowski (Partner 11: University of Silesia), *"Civil Society and Anti-Discrimination Policy in a Homogeneous Country"*

Panel 5: Organised Civil Society and Environmental Policy

Chair: Inaki Barcena (Partner University of Basque Country)

Papers:

Andrzej Niesporek, Kazimiera Wódz and Jacek Wódz (Partner 11: University of Silesia), *"Organized Civil Society in Environmental Policy Making Process in Poland"*

Hans-Jorg Trenz and Erik Jentges (Partner 9: Humboldt University, Berlin): *"Beyond national cleavages? The case of airport protests in France and Germany"*

Panel 6: Organised Civil Society: comparative perspectives across policy sectors

Chair: Carlo Ruzza (Partner 1: University of Trento)

Papers:

Hans-Jorg Trenz (Partner 9: Humboldt University, Berlin) *"Beyond Protest? Patterns of Europeanisation of civil society activism in Germany"*

Elisabeth Dupoirier, Lilian Mathieu, Anne Marijnen (Partner 5: CEVIPOF, Paris) *"Too heavy a burden? The political uses of civil society"*

Kazimiera Wodz, Jacek Wodz and Andrzej Niesporek (Partner 11: University of Silesia) *"Civil society and Democracy in Post-Communist countries: the Case of Poland"*

Emanuela Bozzini (Partner 1: University of Trento) *"Different Forms of Participation and Different Conceptions of Legitimacy. A Discursive Analysis of the Role of Civil Society Organisations in European Policy Processes"*

Panel 7: Organised Civil Society and the EU

Papers:

Stijn Smismans (Partner 1: University of Trento) "Civil society and European governance: normative thoughts in disciplinary bits and pieces"

Panel 8: Transnational Networks and Global Governance

Chair: Stijn Smismans (Partner 1: University of Trento)

Panel 9: Organised Civil Society and Structural Policy

Chair: Simona Piattoni (Partner 1: University of Trento)

Papers:

Monica Ferrin, Josu Larrinaga and Martino Rubal, (Partners 14 and 2: University of Santiago de Compostela/University of Basque Country): "*The Participation of Civil Society in Structural Funds in Galicia and the Basque Country*"

Krzysztof Lecki, Kazimiera Wodz, Jacek Wodz (Partner 11: University of Silesia) "*Civil Society and Structural Policy in New EU Member Countries*"

Elisabeth Dupoirier, (Partner 4: CEVIPOF): "*To What Extent and How Do European Structural Funds Reshape the Relationship Between Political and Economic Actors at the French Regional Level?*"

Lea Koszeghy (Partner 10: ELTE, Budapest) "*Civil Society Organisations in Regional Policy-Making in Hungary. Activists? Intermediators? Experts?*"

Panel 10: Civil Society and Democracy: Theoretical Perspectives

Chair: Hans-Jorg Trezn (Partner 9: Humboldt University, Berlin)

Agreement has been reached with a publisher (Manchester University Press) to publish a book series on Civil Society and Governance (edited by Carlo Ruzza) in which various books disseminating the CIVGOV findings which be published. These include the following

Editors: Partner 1 Chapter authors: all partners	An edited book (edited by Carlo Ruzza and Emanuela Bozzini) comparing civil society-governance relations across the different national contexts represented in the project. This will have country chapters produced by each of the country teams.
Editors: Partner 1 Chapter authors: partners 1,2,6,9	An edited book (edited by Carlo Ruzza) with thematic chapters, focussing on the different policy sectors and on themes such as Europeanisation and the EU level of governance.
Editors: Partner 1 Chapter authors: all partners	An edited book (edited by Carlo Ruzza) comparing anti-racist movements across the different national contexts represented in the project. This will have country chapters produced by each of the country teams.
Editors: Partner 1 Chapter authors: all partners	An edited book (edited by Simona Piattoni) comparing civil society advocacy in structural policy across the different national/regional contexts represented in the project. This will have country chapters produced by each of the country teams
Editors: Partner 6, 14, 8 Chapter authors: all partners	An edited book (edited by Lieven de Winter, Margarita Gomez-Reino and Peter Lynch) comparing minority language/cultural minority movements across the different national/regional contexts represented in the project. This will have country chapters produced by each of the country teams.
Editors: Partner 2 Chapter authors: all partners	An edited book (edited by Inaki Barcena of the University of the Basque Country) comparing environmental movements across the different national contexts represented in the project. This will have country chapters produced by each of the country teams.

Other planned dissemination exercises include the following:

- A book in the Spanish language by the two Spanish teams (Santiago de Compostela and Basque Country – Partners 14 and 2) on civil society in Europe in three sectors: “La Union Europea a la luz de los movimientos anti-racistas, ecologistas y de recuperación lingüística del Estado Español”
- A workshop hosted by Arena, University of Oslo, organised by Hans-Jorg Trenz (Partner 9) on Civil society’s contributions in combating ethnic discrimination: identifying European priorities’

VI. REFERENCES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following works were consulted and/or referred to in the final report:

Alink, F., Boin, A. et al. (2001). 'Institutional Crises and Reforms in Policy Sectors: The Case of Asylum Policy in Europe.' *Journal-of-European-Public-Policy*; 2001, 8, 2, Apr, 286-306.

Ansell, Ch.K.; Parsons, C.A. and Darden, K.A., (1997). 'Dual Networks in European Regional Policy', *Journal of Common Market Studies* 35: 347-76.

Armstrong, K. A. (2001). *Civil Society and the White Paper - Bridging or Jumping the Gaps? Mountain or Molehill? A Critical Appraisal of the Commission White Paper on Governance*, Brussels, European Commission - COM (2001) 428.

Bache, I. (1998): *The Politics of European Union Regional Policy. Multi-level Governance or Flexible Gatekeeping?* Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press.

Bache, I. and Flinders M. (eds.) (2004): *Multi-Level Governance and European Integration*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Banaszak, L. A. (1996). *Why Movements Succeed or Fail: Opportunity, Culture and the Struggle for Woman Suffrage*. Princeton, Princeton University Press.

Bartolini, S. and Mair, P. (1990). *Identity, Competition and Electoral Availability*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Berger, S. (1983). *Introduzione. L'organizzazione degli interessi nell'Europa Occidentale*. S. Berger. Bologna, Il Mulino.

Budge, I. (2000). *Deliberative democracy versus direct democracy - plus political parties! Democratic Innovation*. M. Saward. London, Routledge.

Burstein, P. (1998). "Bringing the Public Back In: Should Sociologists Consider the Impact of Public Opinion on Public Policy?" *Social Forces* 77(1): 27-72.

Burstein, P., A. Eaton, et al. (1997). *Why do Social Movement Organizations, Interest Groups and Political Parties Seem to Have So Little Impact on Public Policy?* American Sociological Association Conference, Toronto, CA.

Bystydzienski, J. and S. P. Schacht, Eds. (2001). *Forging Radical Alliances Across Difference*, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

- Checkel, J. (1999). "Norms, Institutions and National Identity in Contemporary Europe." *International Studies Quarterly* March: 83-114.
- Cohen, J. (1989). *Deliberation and Democratic Legitimacy. The Good Polity. Normative Analysis of the State.* A. Hamlin and P. Pettit. Oxford, Basil Blackwell.
- Commission (2000). "The Commission and non-governmental organisations: building a stronger partnership." COM (00) 11 Final(18.01.2000): 1-26.
- Commission (2000). *Developing New Modes Of Governance.* Brussels, Forward Studies Unit, Notis Lebessis, John Paterson, Working Paper, 2000.
- Dahl, R. A. (1989). *Democracy and its Critics.* New Haven, Yale University Press.
- Diani, M. (1992). "The Concept of Social Movement." *Sociological Review* 40(1): 1-25.
- Dryzek, J. (2000). *Deliberative democracy and beyond: liberals, critics, contestations.* Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Eyerman, R. and A. Jamison (1991). *Social Movements: a Cognitive Approach.* University Park, PA, Pensilvanya State Univ.
- Gamson, W. (1961). "A theory of coalition formation." *American Sociological Review* 26(373-382).
- Gamson, W. (1988). "Political Discourse and Collective Action." *ISR* 1: 219-244.
- Gamson, W., B. Fireman, et al. (1982). *Encounters with Unjust Authority.* Homewood, IL., Dorsey.
- Gamson, W. A. (1975). *The Strategy of Social Protest.* Homewood, Ill, The Dorsey Press.
- Gamson, W. A. (1992). *Talking Politics.* London, Cambridge University Press.
- Gellner, E. (1994). *Conditions of Liberty: Civil Society and its Rivals.* London, Hamish Hamilton.
- Giugni, M. (2004). *Social protest and policy change: ecology, antinuclear, and peace movements in comparative perspective.* Lanham, Md.; Oxford, Rowman & Littlefield.
- Giugni, M., D. McAdam, et al., Eds. (1999). *How Social Movements Matter.* Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.

Giugni, M. and F. Passy (1998). *Contentious Politics in Complex Societies: New Social Movements between Conflict and Cooperation. From Contention to Democracy.* M. Giugni, D. McAdam and C. Tilly. New York, Rowman & Littlefield.

Haas, P. (1992). "Introduction: Epistemic Communities and International Policy Coordination." *International Organization* 46: 1-37, 367-390.

Hirst, P. (1997). *From Statism to Pluralism: democracy, civil society and global politics.* UCL Press, London.

Johnston, H. (1995). *A Methodology for frame analysis: from discourse to cognitive schemata. Social Movements and Culture.* Hank Johnston and B. Klandermans. London, UCL Press.

Keck, M. E. and K. Sikkink (1998). *Activism Beyond Borders.* Ithaca, NY, Cornell University Press.

Klandermans, B. (1988). *The Formation and Mobilization of Consensus. From Structure to Action: Comparing Social Movement Research Across Cultures.* B. Klandermans, H. Kriesi and S. Tarrow. Greenwich, CT, JAI Press: 173-196.

Kohler-Koch, B. (1994). "Changing Patterns of Interest Intermediation in the European Union." *Government and Opposition* 29: 167-180.

Marks, G. and D. McAdam (1996). *Social Movements and the Changing Structure of Political Opportunity in the European Union. Governance in the European Union.* G. Marks, F. W. Scharpf, P. C. Schmitter and W. Streeck. London, Sage: 95-120.

McAdam, D., J. D. McCarthy, et al., Eds. (1996). *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Nentwich, M. (1998). *Opportunity Structures for citizens' participation: the case of the European Union. Political Theory and the European Union. Legitimacy, constitutional choice and citizenship.* London, Routledge.

Offe, C. (1987). *Challenging the boundaries of institutional politics: social movements since the 1960s. Changing Boundaries of the Political.* C. S. Maier. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Pateman, C. (1970). *Participation and Democratic Theory.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Raschke, J. (1985). *Soziale Bewegungen. Ein historisch-systematischer Grundriss.* Frankfurt, Campus.

Ruzza, C. (2000). "Environmental Sustainability and Tourism in European Policy-making." *Innovations* 13(3): 112-129.

Ruzza, C. (2004). *Europe and Civil Society: Movements Coalitions and European Governance.* Manchester, Manchester University Press.

Ruzza, C. (2006). *European Institutions and The Policy Discourse of Organised Civil Society. Civil society and Legitimate European Governance.* S. Smismans. London, Elgar.

Ruzza, C. (2006). *Frame Analysis. Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics.* K. Brown. Oxford, Elsevier.

Sabatier, P. (1998). "The Advocacy Coalition Framework: Revisions and Relevance for Europe." *Journal of European Public Policy* 5(1): 98-130.

Scharpf, F. W. (1999). *Governing in Europe: effective and democratic?* Oxford; New York, Oxford University Press.

Seippel, O. (2001). "From Mobilization to Institutionalization? The Case of Norwegian Environmentalism." *Acta-Sociologica*; 2001, 44, 2, 123-137.

Snow, D. and R. Benford (1992). *Master Frames and Cycles of Protest. Frontiers in Social Movements.* A. Morris, Mueller, C. New Haven Conn., Yale Univ. Press.

Snow, D. A., E. B. Rochford, et al. (1986). "Frame alignment processes, micromobilization and movements participation." *American Sociological Review* 51: 464-481.

Tilly, C. (1978). *From Mobilization to Revolution.* Reading, MA, Addison-Wesley.

Tilly, C. (1979). *Repertoires of contention in America and Britain, 1750-1830. The Dynamics of Social Movements,* Cambridge, Winthrop Publishers.

Walker, J. (1991). *Mobilizing Interest Groups in America: Patrons, Professions and Social Movements.* Ann Arbor, MI, University of Michigan Press.

Warleigh, A. (2001). "Europeanizing Civil Society: NGOs as Agents of Political Socialization in the European Union." *Journal of Common Market Studies* 39(4): 619-639.

Warren, M. E. (2001). *Democracy and Association.* Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Wessels, B. (2004). Contestation potential of interest groups in the EU: emergence, structure, and political alliances. *European Integration and Political Conflict*. G. Marks and M. R. Steenbergen. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Zuo, J. and Benford R.D. (1995). 'Mobilization Processes and the 1989 Chinese Democracy Movement.' in *The Sociological Quarterly* 36(1): 131-155.

VII. ANNEXES

1. Annex 1. Deliverables

Deliverable No	Deliverable title	Delivery date in technical annex	Actual Delivery Date
D1	Report on issue cultures (WP1)	Month 6 (July 2003)	7
D2	State of the Art Report (WP1)	Month 6 (July 2003)	7
D3	Map of Competence (WP1)	Month 6 (July 2003)	7
D4	National representation processes: SMOs and MACs in specific policy areas (WP2)	Month 12 (January 2004)	May 2005
D5	European representation processes: EMACs in specific policy areas (WP3)	Month 18 (July 2004)	November 2005
D6	Policy areas and policy communities (WP4)	Month 24 (January 2005)	May 2006
D7	A model of representation of civil society and movement advocacy in Europe (WP5)	Month 31 (August 2005)	May 2006

See separate deliverables/workpackage reports for more details of work undertaken.

2. Annex 2: Publications, Conferences, Seminars, Papers Presented

Publications and conference papers produced by members of the project co-ordination team (Partner 1), and derived entirely/partly from the project work were as follows (NB. Forthcoming denotes that agreement has been agreed with publisher that publication will take place and that a manuscript is in press or being prepared):

Ruzza, C. and Della Sala, V. (eds.) (forthcoming 2006), *Governance and Civil Society in the European Union: Normative Perspectives*, Manchester, Manchester University Press

Ruzza, C. (2005), "Frame Analysis" in Brown, K. (ed.) *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, Oxford, Elsevier

Ruzza, C. (2004) *Europe and civil society: movement coalitions and European institutions*. Manchester: Manchester University Press. Europe in change, 1

Ruzza, C. (ed.) (forthcoming) *Discriminazione etnica in Italia e governance urbana*, Franco Angeli

Ruzza, C. (2004) 'Società Civile Organizzata e Governance Europea' in *Sociologia Urbana Rurale*, numero speciale *Reti territoriale e reti di ricerca*

Ruzza, C. (forthcoming) 'Identity and Language in Minority Nationalism: the case of the Northern League' in Patrick Leach, *Translation, Language and Identities*, Carocci

Ruzza, C. Chair of Panel on Organised Civil Society – comparison across policy sectors, ECPR Conference Budapest September 2005

Ruzza, C and Fella, S. (2007 forthcoming) *Re-inventing the Italian Right: Territorial Politics, Populism and Post-Fascism*, Routledge

Ruzza, C and Bozzini, E., 'Advocacy Coalitions and Social Movements', presented at the ESA Conference in Tolun, Poland, 11-13 September 2005

Fella, S and Bozzini, E. Paper presented on Panel on Civil Society and Political Parties in Italy, 'Migrant associations and the Governing Parties in Italy - from the Ulivo to the Casa delle Libertà' PSA Conference, Lincoln, April 2004

Fella S. Convenor/Chair of panel on Immigration and Citizenship, PSA Conference, Reading, April 2006

Bozzini, E., Fella, S. and Trenz, H.J. Paper presented on Panel on Immigration and Citizenship, '*Anti-Racist Movements in Britain, Germany and Italy - Comparing Strategies, Political Opportunities and the Effects of Europeanisation*', PSA Conference, Reading, April 2006

Fella, S. ESRC Workshop on Centre-Right Parties and Civil Society, University of Leiden, Paper on *Italian Centre-Right and Civil Society*, February 2006

Fella, S. Workshop at ARENA, Centre for European Studies, Oslo. June 2006. Paper to be presented *Combating ethnic discrimination in Europe: towards a common agenda or still fragmented responses?*

Fella, S and Bigot, G. Paper presented on panel on Racism and Xenophobia in Europe, *Immigration and Discrimination in Italy: Institutional Patterns and Political and Civil Society Responses* World Congress of the International Institute of Sociology, Stockholm, Sweden, July 2005

Fella, S. Chair of Panel Civil Society and Anti-Discrimination Policy: Anti-Racism, ECPR Conference, Budapest, September 2005.

Bozzini, E (2005) 'Governance urbana, partecipazione ed il ruolo della società civile organizzata nelle politiche migratorie a Roma e Londra' in F. Gelli, ed., *La democrazia locale fra rappresentanza e partecipazione*, Franco Angeli

Bozzini, E. (2005) 'Il rapporto fra istituzioni e società civile: una comparazione fra città', in C. Ruzza (ed.), *Discriminazione etnica in Italia e governance urbana*, Franco Angeli.

Bozzini, E (forthcoming) "Partecipazione delle minoranze etniche e nuove forme di governance urbana: i casi di Londra e Roma" in Piselli, F. and Montanari A. (eds.) *Governance urbana e nuove forme di partecipazione* Rubettino

Bozzini, E, 'Governance urbana, partecipazione, ed il ruolo della società civile organizzata nelle politiche migratorie in Italia e Gran Bretagna', Annual Conference SISP, Padova, 15-17 settembre 2004

Bozzini, E, 'Partecipazione delle minoranze etniche e nuove forme di governance urbana: i casi di Londra e Roma', Conference AIS section Territorio e Sociologia Politica, Arcavacata di Rende, 26-28 ottobre 2004

Bozzini, E., Workshop at ARENA, Centre for European Studies, Oslo. June 2006. Paper to be presented: 'Anti-racist movements in Europe: the effects of Europeanisation'

Emanuela Bozzini "Different Forms of Participation and Different Conceptions of Legitimacy. A Discursive Analysis of the Role of Civil Society Organisations in European Policy Processes" ECPR Conference, Budapest September 2005

Stijn Smismans "Civil society and European governance: normative thoughts in disciplinary bits and pieces" ECPR Conference, Budapest September 2005

Stijn Smismans, Chair of Panel on Transnational civil society movements, ECPR September 2005

Stijn Smismans (forthcoming 2006), 'Political theory and the misfit of civil society organisations in European governance; reflexive-deliberative polyarchy as shoe-lift', in Carlo Ruzza and Vincent della Sala (eds.), *Governance and Civil Society in the European Union: Normative Perspectives*, Manchester, Manchester University Press

Simona Piattoni, Chair of Panel on Organised Civil Society and Structural Policy, ECPR Conference, Budapest, September 2005

Simona Piattoni (forthcoming 2007), 'Informal Governance in Structural Policy', *European Perspectives on European Politics and Society* (special issue edited by Jan Van Tatenhove and Jeannette Mak)

Simona Piattoni (forthcoming), 'The Development of Structural Funds: A Success Story?', in T. Conzelmann, B. Laffan and R. Smith (eds) *What Future Shape for the EU? Reflections on Multi-Level Governance*.

The following publications or conference papers, partially informed by the work of the project, have also been produced by members of the project co-ordination team (Partner 1):

Ruzza, C., "Environmental Sustainability and Policy Networks in Tourist Locations" *Foedus*, vol. 10, 2004

Ruzza, C. Book Note ECPR-SG on Extremism & Democracy Volume 6, No. 2, Summer 2004

Ruzza, C. (2004). *Peace Movements. Democracy and Protest*. G. Taylor and M. Todd. Sheffield, Merlin Press.

Ruzza, C. 'The Northern League, Winning Arguments, Losing Influence' in Rydgren, Jens (ed.) *Movements of Exclusion: Radical Right-wing Populism in Western Europe*. Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science. 2005

Ruzza, C. (2004) 'The Northern League' in Lynch, P., Gomez-Reino, M., De Winter, L (ed), ISPS Publications, Barcelona

Ruzza, C. (2004). "Lega Nord i italiensk politik: vunna argument men förlorat inflytande," in Rydgren, Jens and Widfeldt, Anders (eds.) *Från Le Pen till Pim Fortuyn: Populism och parlamentarisk högerextremism i dagens Europa*. (Malmö: Liber)

Ruzza, C and Fella, S. Paper presented on Italian Politics Panel, *Breaking old taboos – the re-invented right in the Italian republic*. PSA Conference, Leeds, UK, April 2005

Ruzza, C and Fella, S. 'Changing political opportunities and the re-invention of the Italian right' in *Politics in Italy: Still in transition*, special issue of *Journal of Southern Europe and the Balkans*, 2006

Fella, S. (2006)'From Fiuggi to the Farnesina – Gianfranco Fini's remarkable journey' *Journal of Contemporary European Studies*

Fella, S (co-editor with Bruno Mascitelli) (forthcoming 2006)Special Issue of *Journal of Southern Europe and the Balkans* 'Italy: the continuing transition'

Fella, S. Paper presented on Panel on Italian Political Parties, '*Stuck in the Middle – the Role of the National Alliance in the Berlusconi Government*' PSA Conference, Lincoln, April 2004

Smismans, S. (ed.) (forthcoming 2006), *Civil Society and Legitimate European Governance*, Cheltenham UK/Northampton USA: Edward Elgar. (single editor of the volume, and author of two chapters)

Smismans, S. (2005), 'How to be Fundamental with Soft Procedures? The Open Method of Coordination and Fundamental Social Rights', in Gráinne de Búrca and Bruno de Witte (eds), *The Protection of Social Rights in Europe: Changes and Challenges*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Smismans, S. (2005), 'Reflexive law in support of directly deliberative polyarchy: Reflexive-deliberative polyarchy as a normative frame for the OMC', in Olivier De Schutter and Simon Deakin (eds), *Social Rights and Market Forces: Is the Open Coordination of Employment and Social Policies the Future of Social Europe?*, Brussels: Bruylant.

Smismans, S. (2005), 'The pluralistic deficit in EU delegated regulation: lessons from the USA at the EU's "constitutional moment"', accepted for publication in the *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies*.

Smismans, S. (2005), 'Un'analisi dell'evoluzione della politica sociale europea attraverso il settore della salute e sicurezza sul lavoro: dalla regolazione alla persuasione', in Antonio Varsori and Laura Leonardi (eds), *Lo spazio sociale europeo*, Firenze: Firenze University Press.

Smismans, S. (2005), 'Europäische Institutionen und Zivilgesellschaft: Diskurse und Interessen', in Michèle Knodt und Barbara Finke (eds), *Europäische Zivilgesellschaft: Konzepte, Akteure, Strategien*, Wiesbaden: VS-Verlag.

Smismans, S. (2005), 'The legitimacy of functional participation in European risk regulation: a case study of occupational health and safety', in Arthur Benz and Yannis Papadopoulos (eds), *Governance and Democracy*, London: Routledge.

Smismans, S.(2005), 'European civil society: institutional discourses and the complexity of a multi-level polity', in Sigrid Rossteutscher (ed), *Democracy and the Role of Associations*, London: Routledge.

Smismans, S. (2004), 'The EU's Schizophrenic Constitutional Debate: Vertical and Horizontal Decentralism in European Governance', Working Paper European University Institute, RSC 2004/32 at http://www.iue.it/RSCAS/WP-Texts/04_32.pdf.

Smismans, S. (2004) 'The constitutional labeling of "the democratic life of the EU": representative and "participatory" democracy', in Andreas Follesdal and Lynn Dobson (eds), *Political Theory and the European Constitution*, London: Routledge, p.122-138.

Smismans, S. (2004), *Law, Legitimacy and European Governance: Functional Participation in Social Regulation*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Smismans, S. (2004) 'Vertical and horizontal decentralism in European governance: discourse, reality and strategy', in Roberto Toniatti, Francesco Palermo and Marco Dani (eds), *An Ever More Complex Union. The Regional Variable as Missing Link in the EU Constitution*, Baden-Baden: Nomos, p.57-82.

Smismans, S. (2004) 'EU Employment Policy: Decentralisation or Centralisation through the Open Method of Coordination?', in Roberto Toniatti, Francesco Palermo and Marco Dani (eds), *An Ever More Complex Union. The Regional Variable as Missing Link in the EU Constitution*, Baden-Baden: Nomos, p.291-312.

Stijn Smismans, (2006) 'New Modes of Governance and the Participatory Myth', European Governance Papers (EUROGOV), No.06-01, <http://www.connex-network.org/eurogov/pdf/egp-newgov-N-06-01.pdf>

Stijn Smismans (forthcoming 2006) 'A Neo-corporatist setting for self-regulation in the EU', in Andreas Nolke and Jean-Christophe Graz (eds.), *Transnational Private Governance*, Routledge.

Stijn Smismans (forthcoming 2006) 'The European Economic and Social Committee', in Smit and Herzog (eds.), *The Law of the European Union*.

Stijn Smismans (forthcoming 2006) 'European Citizenship Through Networking?', in Simona Piattoni and Riccardo Scartezzini (eds.), *European Citizenship: Theories, Arenas, Levels*, Edward Elgar.

Other publications and conference papers produced by project partners, and derived entirely/partly from the project work were as follows:

Partner 2: University of Basque Country

Inaki Barcena: Paper 'European Governance and the Green Social Movements: a reflection on GMOs and Transport policies in Spain' presented at International Conference "Nature, Science and Social Movements" at Mytilene (Greece) June 2004.

Inaki Barcena: 'European Governance and Green Social Movements: Transport and GMO policies in Spain', *Human Ecology Review*, 12, 2 (2005).

Inaki Barcena, Paper 'Green movements and European governance. A reflection on GMOs and Transport policies' submitted to ECPR Joint Sessions in Granada, Workshop "Comparing Environmentalism North and South" April 2004

Inaki Barcena, Chair of a panel on 'Organised Civil Society and Environmental Policy', ECPR Conference, Budapest, September 2005

Margarita Gómez-Reino; Mónica Ferrín; Josu Larrinaga; Martiño Rubal: "Spanish Civil Society and the protection of Basque, Catalan and Galician Languages in a Multilevel Space" ECPR Conference, Budapest, September 2005

Monica Ferrin, Josu Larrinaga and Martino Rubal, "The Participation of Civil Society in Structural Funds in Galicia and the Basque Country" ECPR Conference, Budapest, September 2005

The Basque team was present at several conferences and courses where they explained the project and presented the main results.

Partner 4: CEVIPOF, Paris

Elisabeth Dupoirier paper on Structural Funds in France in conference "The Economic Interest Groups and the European Union", CEVIPOF/Institut d'Etudes Politiques de Paris, September 2004.

Lilian Mathieu, discussant during conference "Interest groups in the 21st century", CEVIPOF/Institut d'Etudes Politiques de Paris, September 2004.

Olivier Fillieule, Anne Marijnen, "Alliances for all and Europeanisation for a few: Anti GMOs mobilisations in France", ECPR joint sessions UPPSALA 2004, Workshop 8 The Changing Structure of Civil Society.

Odette Tomescu-Hatto, paper on "The EU as a leverage for the regional languages in France, May, 2005, Institut for Political Studies, Rennes

Elisabeth Dupoirier, Lilian Mathieu, Anne Marijnen "*Too heavy a burden? The political uses of civil society*", ECPR Conference, Budapest, September 2005

Elisabeth Dupoirier "*To What Extent and How Do European Structural Funds Reshape the Relationship Between Political and Economic Actors at the French Regional Level?*" ECPR Conference, Budapest, September 2005

Partner 5: Hellenic Open University, Greece

Afouxenidis, A. (2004) "Social Capital and NGOS in Greece" *Journal Civil Society*, 10, pp. 60-65 (in Greek).

Afouxenidis, A. (2004) "Urban Social Movements: reflections on Toni Negri's 'The Mass and the Metropolis'" *7th International Conference on Urban History: European City in Comparative Perspective*, Panteion University of Athens (an updated version of this paper will be published in the English journal 'City').

Afouxenidis, A. (2005) "Media, Culture, Politics and Ideology: from social movements to voluntarism" In Fragonikolopoulos X. (ed), *Media Society and Politics*, Publications Sideris, pp. 311-321 (in Greek).

Afouxenidis, A. (2006) "Actions and Functioning of the Third Sector in Greece: using qualitative research methods to interpret the phenomenon" In Katsikidis S. (ed), *Analysing Social Phenomena*, Gutenberg Publications (forthcoming, in Greek).

Furthermore there are, at the moment, at least two more articles under way due to be published in 2006 and 2007, in Greek and in English.

As this is the first time that such detailed work has been undertaken in Greece, there has been extended interest from individuals and groups concerning the nature of our findings. Colleagues from other academic institutions have utilised our reports and we have also disseminated these to some of the NGOs interviewed. Finally, an abbreviated version of the reports was published (in Greek) on the internet (www.ppol.gr).

A conference will be held with 2 other universities in order to discuss and examine the structure and management of the Greek Third Sector and NGOs. This will take place at the beginning of July 2006 and we expect that a book will be published as a result of the papers submitted to the conference.

Partner 6: Catholic University of Louvain, Belgium

Lieven de Winter, Chair of panel on Organised Civil Society and Linguistic and Cultural Minority Rights Protection, ECPR Conference, Budapest, September 2005

Huri Tursan, "*The Grey Book of Anti-Racism in Belgium*" ECPR Conference, Budapest, September 2005

Partner 8: University of Stirling, Scotland

Peter Lynch, Discussant on panel 'Organised Civil Society and Linguistic and Cultural Minority Rights Protection, ECPR Conference, Budapest, September 2005

Partner 9: Humboldt University, Berlin

Hans-Jörg Trenz, (2005) *Dying Species or Forerunners of a Transnational Civil Society: Language Minorities in Germany, France and Spain*", ARENA Working Paper Series 20/2005. University of Oslo.

Hans-Jörg Trenz (2005) „Öffentlichkeit und Zivilgesellschaft in der EU. Zwischen Organisation und spontaner Selbstkonstitution, in Barbara Finke und Michelle Knodt (eds.). *Europäisierung der Zivilgesellschaften oder Europäische Zivilgesellschaft: Konzepte, Akteure, Strategien*". Opladen: Leske und Budrich.

Eder, Klaus/Hans-Jörg Trenz (2005) Prerequisites of Democracy and Mechanisms of Democratisation. Forthcoming in Beate Kohler-Koch (Hrsg.). Debating the Democratic Legitimacy of the European Union. Boulder: Rowman&Littlefield (together with Klaus Eder).

Eder, Klaus. (2004). From the Common Market to the Political Union. The shifting opportunity structure of contentious politics in Europe. In Charles Tilly & Maria Kousis (Eds.), *Threats and Opportunities in Contentious Politics* (pp. 99-113). Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

Eder, Klaus. (2005). La politique contestataire et la gouvernance transnationale: l'expérience européenne. In Louis Guay, Pierre Hamel, Dominique Masson & Jean-Guy Vaillancourt (Eds.), *Mouvements sociaux et changements institutionnels* (pp. 35-55). Québec: Presses de l'Université de Québec.

The German team presented its results at the Conference on Language and Communication in Cardiff, July 2005.

.Hans-Jorg Trenz: Organiser of Workshop at ARENA, Centre for European Studies, University of Oslo: 'Civil society's contributions in combating ethnic discrimination: identifying European priorities'; Presenter of Introductory Paper 'Common challenges but fragmented responses? Re-defining the agenda of ethnic discrimination in Europe'

Hans-Jorg Trenz (with E Bozzini and S Fella), Paper presented on Panel on Immigration and Citizenship, '*Anti-Racist Movements in Britain, Germany and Italy - Comparing Strategies, Political Opportunities and the Effects of Europeanisation*', PSA Conference, Reading, April 200

Hans-Jorg Trenz, Discussant on panel, 'Civil Society and Anti-Discrimination Policy: Anti-Racism', ECPR Conference, Budapest, September 2005

Hans-Jorg Trenz, Chair of panel, 'Civil Society and Democracy: Theoretical Perspectives', ECPR Conference, Budapest, September 2005

Hans-Jorg Trenz and Erik Jentges, "*Beyond national cleavages? The case of airport protests in France and Germany*", ECPR Conference, Budapest, September 2005

Hans-Jorg Trenz "*Beyond Protest? Patterns of Europeanisation of civil society activism in Germany*", ECPR Conference, Budapest, September 2005

Partner 10: University Etovos Lorand, Hungary

Lea Koszeghy "Civil Society Organisations in Regional Policy-Making in Hungary. Activists? Intermediators? Experts?" ECPR Conference, Budapest, September 2005

The Hungarian team will publish a book in Hungarian, discussing civil society in all three sectors.

Partner 11: University of Silesia

Andrzej Niesporek and Kazimiera Wodz participated in *The International Social Work and Society Academy* in Gdańsk on 26-31 August 2005

"Polish organised Civil Society. NGO in community work. Toward the new social work challenges."

Maciej Witkowski, Krzysztof Lecki and Kazimiera Wódz: "*Organised Civil Society and Linguistic and Cultural Minority Rights Protection*" ECPR Conference, Budapest, September 2005

Kazimiera Wódz, Jacek Wódz, Maciej Witkowski "*Civil Society and Anti-Discrimination Policy in a Homogeneous Country*" ECPR Conference, Budapest, September 2005

Andrzej Niesporek, Kazimiera Wódz and Jacek Wódz "*Organized Civil Society in Environmental Policy Making Process in Poland*" ECPR Conference, Budapest, September 2005

Kazimiera Wodz, Jacek Wodz and Andrzej Niesporek "*Civil society and Democracy in Post-Communist countries: the Case of Poland*" ECPR Conference, Budapest, September 2005

Krzysztof Lecki, Kazimiera Wodz, Jacek Wodz "*Civil Society and Structural Policy in New EU Member Countries*" ECPR Conference, Budapest, September 2005

Partner 12: Södertörn University College, Stockholm

Hobson, Barbara, Marcus Carson and Rebecca Lawrence (in press, 2005) "Recognition Struggles in Trans-national Arenas: Negotiating Identities and Framing Citizenship" in (Birte Siim and Judith Squires (eds.) *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy* (Special Issue, Autumn 2005).

Lawrence, Rebecca (in press) "Sámi, citizenship and non-recognition in Sweden and the European Union", in Cant, G., Goodall, A., and Inns, J., (eds) *Discourses and Silences: Indigenous peoples, risks and resistances*, University Canterbury Press.

Carson, Marcus (2005) Hinder eller möjlighet? Europisering, demokrati och civilt samhälle (trans: Obstacles or opportunities? Europeanization, democracy, and civil society) in Sörbom, Adrienne (ed), Den tömda demokratin – och vägerna tillbaka till makten. Stockholm: Agora

Kamlage, Jan-Hendrik (2004) "European Regional Policy: An Analysis of the Horizontal Partnership Model for the Cases of Mecklenburg-Vorpommern (Germany) and Norra Norrland (Sweden)". Masters Thesis, Graduate School of Social Sciences, University of Bremen

Helgren, Zenia (2005) "The Myth of the Multicultural Society: Immigrant Mobilization contesting the Swedishness of Structures" Paper presented at the Annual Aage Sorensen Memorial Conference. Harvard University April 20-21, 2005

Carson, Marcus, and Barbara Hobson (2006) "Boomerangs, ping-pong balls, and other effects of multi-level policymaking on the success of Swedish immigrant organizations and women's movement". Paper to be presented at the 15th Annual Conference of the Council for European Studies, Chicago, USA. 29 March – April 2, 2006.

Tidholm, Svante (2005) "Swedish Environmental Organizations and European Networks" B-Uppsats, South Stockholm University College, Spring, 2005

Hellgren, Zenia (spring 2006) "Att överbygga klyftan mellan lag och handling", to be published in "Den osynliga muren", Sami Lipponen and Tom R. Burns (eds).

Carson, Marcus and Tom R. Burns (spring 2006) The Swedish Dilemma: the politics of Racism and Xenophobia (working title). To be published as part of Governmental investigation on Structural Discrimination.

Helgren, Zenia (fall 2006) "Myten om multikulturella samhället: teoretiska perspektiv på mångkulturalismen" in Sociologiska perspektiv på etniska relationer, Mehrdad Darvishpour (ed).

Hellgren, Zenia and Barbara Hobson (fall 2006) "Sweden's women's movement and ethnic/anti-discrimination organizations: is the EU relevant?" in Gender Issues and Women's Movements in the Expanding European Union. Barbara Hobson, (ed.)

Partner 14: University of Santiago de Compostela

Marga Gómez-Reino: Workshop at ARENA, Centre for European Studies, University of Oslo, June 2006: 'Civil society's contributions in combating ethnic discrimination: identifying European priorities.' Paper to be presented: The heterogeneity of antiracist mobilisation in the EU: beyond the north-south divide?

Margarita Gómez-Reino; Mónica Ferrín; Josu Larrinaga; Martiño Rubal, University of Santiago de Compostela/University of the Basque Country): "*Spanish Civil Society and the protection of Basque, Catalan and Galician Languages in a Multilevel Space*" ECPR Conference, Budapest, September 2005

Monica Ferrin, Josu Larrinaga and Martino Rubal, "*The Participation of Civil Society in Structural Funds in Galicia and the Basque Country*" ECPR Conference, Budapest, September 2005

Margarita Gómez-Reino, "*Spain, European Civil Society and Antiracism*" ECPR Conference, Budapest, September 2005

European Commission

EUR 23135 — EU RESEARCH ON SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HUMANITIES — Organised civil society and European governance - CIVGOV

Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities

2007 — 210 pp. — 21,0 x 29,7 cm

ISBN 978-92-79-07589-6

How to obtain EU publications

Our priced publications are available from EU Bookshop (<http://bookshop.europa.eu/>), where you can place an order with the sales agent of your choice.

The Publications Office has a worldwide network of sales agents. You can obtain their contact details by sending a fax to (352) 29 29-42758.

