

Project: **The Transformation of Political Mobilisation and Communication in European Public Spheres**

Project acronym: Europub.com
Project website: <http://europub.wz-berlin.de>

Funded by: 5th Framework Programme of the European Commission

Contract No. HPSE-CT2000-00046
Work package: **WP 5 and 6 (Delphi)**
WP Coordinator: Paul Statham
Deliverable number: **D 6.5**

Report **Final Delphi report**

Case report **Germany**

Author: Silke Adam, Barbara Berkel

Date: 23 April 2004

Contents:

I Analytic Summary.....	3
II General Overview.....	6
III Detailed Analysis of Actor` Perceptions.....	7
1. State Actors.....	7
i. Perceptions of direction of European Integration.....	7
ii. Evaluation of European integration and role and performance of EU institutions in this process.....	8
2. Political Party Actors.....	9
i. Perceptions of direction of European Integration.....	9
ii. Evaluation of European integration and role and performance of EU institutions in this process.....	9
3. Interest Group Actors.....	10
i. Perceptions of direction of European Integration.....	10
ii. Evaluation of European integration and role and performance of EU institutions in this process.....	11
4. NGO Actors.....	12
i. Perceptions of direction of European Integration.....	12
ii. Evaluation of European integration and role and performance of EU institutions in this process.....	13

I. Analytic Summary

The goal of this analysis is to get a better understanding of the overall evaluation of the process of European Integration of actors of the state, parties, interest groups and non-governmental organizations in Germany. Generally, a clear societal consensus was observed that the *European region* predominantly benefits from European Integration. The interviewed actors believe that the process of European Integration contributes to security, political stability, economic growth and competitiveness in the European Region. Only according to the aspects environmental protection and social equality the interviewees were less optimistic.

With regard to future expectations and desires the interviewees were asked how they generally perceived the process of European Integration and if they agreed with this development. It is important to note that the answers were given to open questions. That means that different interviewees emphasised different aspects of European Integration according to their personal priorities. Not all interviewees have therefore discussed the up-coming enlargement of the EU for example. In the following, we want to give an overview of the given answers regarding the main areas, the temporal dimension and the outcome of a perceived change of the EU.

Field and Type of Change

Governmental and party actors anticipate further steps of deepening and widening the European Union. While European Integration in the beginning was predominantly economically driven, changes will now concern political integration. Therefore many actors expect inner adjustments of priorities. If for example a common foreign policy will develop, the Common Agricultural Policy in turn is awaited to become less important. Political actors additionally perceive that the citizenry is not electrified by the integration process anymore. For many citizens Europe has become part of everyday life. This on the one hand would enhance a feeling of European identity, but on the other lead to less comprehension of necessary steps of integration.

For the *interest groups* the paradox of deepening and widening of the European Union seems to be a central concern. Most interest groups expect a deepening of the Union despite the agreed upon enlargement process towards the East. For the *NGOs* this topic is less central. They refer to various fields and types of change. Some of them do regard the process of European integration as chaotic and thus the type of change as not predictable. One representative fears the lowering of social standards, the cultural partition within Europe and the closing-off towards the Third World. Another NGO actor stresses a similar point when he claims, that the policy process is dominated by the search for compromises bringing forward results that do not go beyond the smallest denominator. This will further increase the spiral of weakening standards. Another representative refers to the challenge of reforming the common foreign and security policy.

Time of Change

Governmental and party actors have scarcely referred to a temporal dimension of change. With regard to the discussion about the support of the United States during the war in Iraq many actors have doubts that a common foreign policy can be realised in the short run. Also with regard to a common immigration policy, one responsible governmental actor is convinced that it would still be a long way to go. One member of the Liberals thinks that the whole process of European Integration would be far too slow, at a crawl.

None of the representatives of *interest groups and NGOs* calls for a slowing down of the integration process. In contrast, some NGO actors demand an increase in the speed of *political* integration. Also an interest group representative sees the danger that in the future the level of integration could possibly deteriorate again.

Outcome of Change

Asked how they perceive the process of European integration, many governmental and party actors refer to the many wars Europe has experienced. They see the long-lasting period of peace as one of the major achievements of European Integration and at the same time as prove that a European Union is politically the right direction. Within this frame they judge further steps of deepening and widening the EU as desirable goal. A party member of the social democrats as well as one party member of the conservatives see a European government respectively a European state of the nations as political goal. Only one member of the Conservatives stresses that the EU had geographical limits (with regard to Turkey). Compared to the grand vision of the EU, most actors do not want to overemphasize criticism.

Nevertheless, particularly governmental actors dealing with immigration and agricultural policy verbalize criticism regarding the practical implementation of European integration. For example one member of the German Ministry of Finance points out that the Common Agricultural Policy gulped far more money than the macroeconomic significance of the agricultural sector would justify. The EU institutions however, are generally perceived more critically. About half of the governmental actors complain that national interests are too influential (particularly within the EU commission) and that the institutions are too distant from the citizenry.

Overall, the European integration project is agreed upon by interest groups and NGOs. This integration-supportive attitude is slightly stronger characterising the interest groups compared to NGOs. A substantial part of NGO actors do criticise EU institutions. Interestingly, in addition to the bureaucratic character of the EU, they stress – as the governmental actors themselves - much more prominently the problem that EU institutions are strongly dependent on national governments. This is regarded as the main weakness of EU institutions leading to a system-immanent break for European integration.

Specific focus:

Interest group actors and actors from NGOs do have a quite similar focus on the problems and challenges of the EU. Both actor types refer to the challenge *of improving* political debate and the inclusion of civil society. This contributes to make the process of EU integration *more transparent to EU* citizens. As a second focus the challenges to reform the decision structures within the EU after the enlargement process are mentioned by actors from interest groups and NGOs. Thirdly, both actor types refer to the type of Union. The Union is perceived by some of them as strongly dominated by economic interests. Consequently, some of the interviewed persons stress the *necessity for a stronger political Union* which goes beyond the EU as a pure economic project. Finally, there is a fourth commonality between interest group actors and NGO actors: within both groups there are actors who are concerned about the loss of regional peculiarities and the following unifications.

II. General Overview

The interviewed actors perceive the contribution of European integration to the region in general very positively. Table 1 shows the average answers to the question, if the process of European integration contributes to security, political stability, etc., ranking from never (0), partly (1,5) to yes (3).

Table 1: Actors' perceptions on whether European Integration contributes to specific developments in the European Region

	ALL	State Actors	Parties	Interest Groups	NGOs	Journalists
1. Security	2,8	2,9	2,8	3,0	2,5	3
2. Political stability	2,8	2,8	3,0	3,0	2,4	3
3. Economic growth	2,8	2,6	2,9	2,8	2,6	3
4. Economic competitiveness	2,8	2,8	2,9	2,9	2,7	3
5. Environmental protection	2,3	2,1	2,3	2,6	2,1	2,1
6. Social equality	1,9	2,4	2,0	2,3	1,4	1,5
ALL	2,6	2,6	2,7	2,8	2,3	2,6
N (Max numbers)	61	12	12	11	12	14

In all, the interviewed actors believe that the process of European integration contributes to security, political stability, economic growth and competitiveness in the European region. The aspects of environmental protection and social equality scored a little worse. The interviewed actors are less sure if the process of European integration qualifies to enhance those. In contrary, many interviewees rather expect a lowering of social standards due to the process of European integration.

Apparently there is *a clear societal consensus across German actor types* – be they state actors, party actors, interest groups, NGOs or journalists – *that the European region predominantly benefits from European integration*. Comparatively, non-governmental organisations have the most critical stance. More than any other actor type, they are uncertain if European integration enhances political stability and security. Their major doubts however, concern the effects on environmental protection and social equality. In this respect journalists are equally hesitant.

III. Detailed Analysis of Actors' Perceptions

The goal of this analysis is to get a better understanding of future expectations and desires regarding different dimensions of the process of European integration of actors of the state, parties, interest groups and non-governmental organizations in Germany. Therefore all interview partners were asked how they generally perceive the process of European integration, if they agree with this development and how they judge the role and performance of EU institutions in this context. In the following we want to give an overview of the answers with respect to the different actor types. Included were the answers of 12 state, 12 party actors, 11 interest group representatives and 12 non-governmental organization actors. Due to organizational problems, these questions were not discussed with journalists who therefore have to be neglected in this part of the analysis.

1) State Actors

i. Perceptions of direction of European Integration

Many of the interviewed state actors mentioned *the prevention of war* as major driving force of European Integration. Representing the thoughts of others, the member of the German Ministry of Agriculture stated that European Integration was the best that had happened to Europe during the past 1000 years. When 25 countries sit at one table and negotiate in about 18 languages, it means for him that mankind has got a new character.¹ Further integration in the sense of deepening and widening the EU is therefore seen as (desirable) necessity for the future of the member states.

Considering a shorter perspective, some interviewees remark that European integration in the beginning was mainly economically driven (cp. agricultural policy). They expect that the political integration will not happen as quickly and unproblematically. The discussion around the conflict with the United States because of the war against Iraq indicates for many a split of Europe. It also depends on the outcome of this and similar conflicts which policy fields the integration process will include in the future. The member of the Ministry of Agriculture in North Rhine-Westphalia explains that if a common foreign and security policy would be possible the role of Common Agricultural Policy would have to be reduced.² The member of the administrative body responsible for refugees concludes with regard to the political integration: 'It is still a long way to go.'³

¹ German Ministry of Agriculture, Ministerialdirigent, 8th of July 2003

² North Rhine-Westphalian Ministry of Agriculture, Head of department, 28th of May 2003

³ Zentralstelle für die Anerkennung ausländischer Flüchtlinge, Head of department, 2nd of June 2003

ii. Evaluation of

a) European Integration

The overall majority of state actors agrees with further European Integration in the sense of deepening and widening the EU. Particularly the ones who are active in the field of European Integration are positive. However, the actors active in the areas of immigration and agricultural policy perceive the realisation of the general idea more critically. The member of the Ministry of Finance for example questions whether in the long run the importance of agricultural policy justifies to gulp as much money as at present.⁴ A member of the Bavarian Ministry of Agriculture complains that the important questions of European Integration would be moved to the background while details are discussed.⁵

b) Role and performance of EU institutions in this process

With regard to the role and performance of EU institutions German state actors are divided in two groups. Half of the actors positively emphasize the role of the EU institutions and particularly the EU Commission as guard of the treaties and engine of the process of integration. In their eyes existing faults weigh less than the general outstanding role of the institutions. E.g. the member of the German Ministry of Agriculture hands out top marks for all institutions because in a historical development we could only hand out best marks. He explains that just a week ago 25 nations had decided on one item which would be a sensation.⁶

The other half of the actors rather underline *the weaknesses*. The institutions would move slowly and would not necessarily be helpful, sometimes they would act very diplomatically and then again they would be driven by a sudden hectic. Particularly the EU Commission is criticised. A member of the German Ministry of Finance thinks that the EU Commission acts far too distanced from the citizenry within an ivory tower.⁷ The member of the Bavarian Ministry of the Interior underlines the influence of national interests within the EU Commission. He is convinced that further influence of the EU on immigration policy means more immigrants for Germany. He illustrates this by pointing at the Commissioner at present: As a Portuguese he wouldn't see the necessity to regulate immigration (Portugal would only have 1,8% foreigners). Thus he expects the main pressure of immigration to remain with Germany, France and the United Kingdom.⁸

⁴ German Ministry of Finance, Referatsleiter, 22nd of July 2003

⁵ Bavarian Ministry of Agriculture, Ministerialdirigent, 24th April 2003

⁶ German Ministry of Agriculture, Ministerialdirigent, 8th of July 2003

⁷ German Ministry of Finance, Referatsleiter "Europa", 14th August 2003

⁸ Bavarian Ministry of the Interior, Head of department, 2nd of June 2003

2) Political Party Actors

i. Perceptions of direction of European integration

The four main political parties in Germany, SPD, CDU/CSU, Bündnis90/DieGrünen and FDP, generally expect that the European Union will further be deepened. They point out the contribution of the European integration to peace and stability which would too often been taken for granted. In the long run, some respondents even aim at a European government.⁹

Unlike the government, several party actors take the perception of the public into consideration. A member of the Conservatives states, that more and more people would think in terms of Europe. While borders disappeared Europe had become more natural for the average citizen. He therefore expects Europe to become one day a Union of the states.¹⁰ Maybe Europe has become too normal, thinks one Social democrat who is irritated that even the EU Convention would not electrify people. Even though there were many good reasons for integration if one only remembered the murder and killing in Europe in previous times.¹¹

ii. Evaluation of

a) European Integration

All party actors agree very much with the general development of further European integration. A member of the liberal democrats complains about the slow, snail like speed of the whole integration process (“Schnecken tempo”).¹² But with regard to the general question of widening or deepening the EU, only one conservative verbalises objections against further geographical extension of the EU. In his eyes Turkey should not become a member of the EU because of ‘structural reasons’.¹³ Herewith he might hint at the economic weakness of Turkey but also at other structural obstacles like the stage of agricultural development.

b) Role and Performance of EU institutions in this process

Most party actors have not answered this question due to a lack of time. The few answers given are generally rather positive and acknowledge that the EU institutions had done a lot for making the EU more attractive to the broad people. One member of the Greens particularly supports the work of the Commissioner for Enlargement, Günter Verheugen.¹⁴ One member of the Social Democrats criticises that at the moment the process of European integration and the EU institutions would only fit a small EU, bureaucratic as they are. In the course of enlargement however, this would have to

⁹ Fraction of SPD in the German Parliament, EU affairs speaker, 27th of May 2003

¹⁰ Fraction of CDU/CSU in the German Parliament, committee for consumers, 24th of June 2003

¹¹ Fraction of SPD in the German Parliament, Home affairs speaker, 25th of September 2003

¹² Fraction of FDP in the German Parliament, EU affairs speaker, 7th of May 2003

¹³ Fraction of CDU/CSU in the German Parliament, EU affairs speaker, 25th of September 2003

¹⁴ Fraction of Bündnis 90/Die Grünen in the German Parliament, EU affairs speaker, 30th of April 2003

change. A solution would be not to regulate everything in detail but to allow for regional peculiarities.¹⁵

3) Interest group Actors

i. Perceptions of direction of European integration

This section can be separated into two parts. The first one deals with the question which future direction the Union is taking. The second part refers to the future problems and challenges the Union is facing.

Seven interest group representatives define the future path the EU will take. Most of them expect a deepening of the integration.¹⁶ The German Association of Chambers of Commerce and Industry¹⁷ in contrast anticipates that there will be less deepening, but rather more enlargement. Also the German Labour Unions¹⁸ see the enlargement process as central to the future direction of the EU: with the enlargement the European Union will reach a new quality what will require modifications of its decision-making structures.

Challenges and problems of the European Union are multi-facet. Three interest group representatives refer to the challenge of strengthening civil society and political debate. The representative of the German Labour Union¹⁹ stresses the necessity for political debate. Some achievements, he claims, are values per se (like EMU), but others have to be looked at in detail to find out whether they really improve things for citizens, regions or countries or not. The consortium of farmers²⁰ points out that it is necessary that the affected persons are allowed to take part in the development of policies. Unfortunately, the representative adds, this is not always the case – in agricultural policy for example countries like Poland will face the problem of social unbalances without having participated in the policy process. The consumer advice centre²¹ sees the main difficulties of integration in the structurally problematic process of developing a public sphere with public opinion, a European democracy and representation of civil society actors on the European level. Two actors are concerned about the right level of integration. The German Association of Chambers of Commerce and Industry²² asks whether there could possibly be a drawback / a deterioration of the already

¹⁵ Fraction of SPD in the German Parliament, committee for consumers, 5th of May 2003

¹⁶ See: Union (Deutscher Gewerkschaftsbund), Secretary for EU affairs, April 17th 2003; European Movement Germany (Europäische Bewegung Deutschland), Secretary General, August 22nd 2003; Employer's association (Bundesvereinigung der deutschen Arbeitgeberverbände), press secretary, June 24th 2003; Commission of the German bishops of the Catholic Church (Kommissariat der dt. Bischöfe der Katholischen Kirche), judicial consultant, December 4th 2003; German Farmer's Union (Deutscher Bauernverband), president, May 23rd 2003.

¹⁷ Deutschen Industrie- und Handelstag, head of EU policy, June 5th 2003

¹⁸ Deutscher Gewerkschaftsbund, secretary for migration affairs, August 12th 2003

¹⁹ Deutscher Gewerkschaftsbund, Secretary for EU affairs, April 17th 2003

²⁰ Arbeitsgemeinschaft bäuerliche Landwirtschaft, secretary general, May 13th 2003

²¹ Bundesverband Verbraucherzentrale, press officer, July 7th

²² Deutschen Industrie- und Handelstag, head of EU policy, June 5th 2003

achieved level of integration. The German Raiffeisenverband²³ regrets that the EU is not developing into an important political Union.

The European Movement of Germany²⁴ is worried that the elite is not dealing sufficiently with the risks and opportunities of further integration. The German Union²⁵ sees the main challenge in the modification of the decision structures of the EU after the enlargement process. The Saxonian Farmer's Association²⁶ sees the challenge for the EU in its further reinforcement without a blurring of regional specialities.

ii. Evaluation of

a) European integration

European integration is strongly agreed on within the German representatives of interest groups.²⁷ Some of them do see challenges regarding the principle of subsidiarity, demand a stronger inclusion of social questions and regret it that enlargement retards the political unification of Europe. To sum up, the integration process is agreed on without an alternative. One representative even states that it is no question anymore whether one agrees with this process or not – it is there.²⁸

b) Role and performances of EU institutions

In general approximately half of the representatives of interest groups in Germany evaluate the performance of EU institutions overtly positive²⁹ as they are the engine of the integration process, not so much the member states. The representatives of the Catholic Church and the Saxonian Farmer's Association although supporting the insti-

²³ Deutscher Raiffeisenverband, deputy secretary, May 27th 2003

²⁴ Europäische Bewegung Deutschland, Secretary General, August 22nd 2003

²⁵ Deutscher Gewerkschaftsbund, secretary for migration affairs, August 12th 2003

²⁶ Sächsischer Bauernverband, secretary general, April 24th 2003

²⁷ See: German Association of Chambers of Commerce and Industry (Deutschen Industrie- und Handelstag) head of EU policy, June 5th 2003; Union (Deutscher Gewerkschaftsbund), Secretary for EU affairs, April 17th 2003; European Movement Germany (Europäische Bewegung Deutschland), Secretary General, August 22nd 2003; Employer's association (Bundesvereinigung der deutschen Arbeitgeberverbände), press secretary, June 24th 2003; Commission of the German bishops of the Catholic Church (Kommissariat der dt. Bischöfe der Katholischen Kirche), judicial consultant, December 4th 2003; Consortium of farmers (Arbeitsgemeinschaft bäuerliche Landwirtschaft), secretary general, May 13th 2003; Saxonian Farmer's Association (Sächsischer Bauernverband), secretary general, April 24th 2003; German Raiffeisenverband, deputy secretary, May 27th 2003; consumer advice centre (Bundesverband Verbraucherzentrale), press officer, July 7th; German Farmer's Union (Deutscher Bauernverband), president, May 23rd 2003.

²⁸ Commission of the German bishops of the Catholic Church (Kommissariat der dt. Bischöfe der Katholischen Kirche), judicial consultant, December 4th 2003

²⁹ See: German Association of Chambers of Commerce and Industry (Deutschen Industrie- und Handelstag) head of EU policy, June 5th 2003; Union (Deutscher Gewerkschaftsbund), Secretary for EU affairs, April 17th 2003; Employer's association (Bundesvereinigung der deutschen Arbeitgeberverbände), press secretary, June 24th 2003; Commission of the German bishops of the Catholic Church (Kommissariat der dt. Bischöfe der Katholischen Kirche), judicial consultant, December 4th 2003; Consortium of farmers (Arbeitsgemeinschaft bäuerliche Landwirtschaft), secretary general, May 13th 2003; Saxonian Farmer's Association (Sächsischer Bauernverband), secretary general, April 24th 2003.

tutions hope for a more central role of the European Parliament.³⁰ The consortium of farmers and the ‘Deutscher Raiffeisenverband’ criticise that civilians are poorly integrated.³¹ The German Union and the consumer advice centre demand a European government. National institutions are still too strong in the European Union, they claim.³² The European Movement and the consumer advice centre also stress the importance of communication strategies of European institutions and hope that transparency towards the public can be improved.³³

4) *NGO actors*

i. Perceptions of direction of European integration

This section can be separated into two parts. The first one deals with the question which future direction the Union is taking. The second part refers to the future problems and challenges the Union is facing.

Regarding future directions there is a variety of scenarios brought forward by NGO actors. Two of them do not see any direction within the integration process at all. They characterise the process as chaotic. To highlight this point, the press officer of an environmental organisation³⁴ refers to the different opinions during the Iraq war. In agricultural policy, he adds, there is no direction but an “everybody against each other” mentality. Another representative of an environmental organisation³⁵ explains that although he is a convinced European, the integration process is without a direction as it is completely *intransparent for citizens*. The question of widening and deepening is not as central to NGO actors compared to interest group actors. Only two of them refer to it. The consultant in a regional refugee organisation³⁶ does not conceive of widening and deepening as contradictory. The deputy secretary of the Turkish community in Germany³⁷ expects a deepening of integration within the old member states combined with an enlargement process. For Turkey he sees no chance to enter the community as now with 25 members there will be no consensus on the accession anymore (“der Zug ist abgefahren”). Nevertheless, the European Union will gain more weight in the world, he claims. An expert of EU affairs of ATTAC³⁸ sees European integration as a pure economic project in which member states seek to increase their competitiveness.

³⁰ Commission of the German bishops of the Catholic Church (Kommissariat der dt. Bischöfe der Katholischen Kirche), judicial consultant, December 4th 2003; Saxonian Farmer’s Association (Sächsischer Bauernverband), secretary general, April 24th 2003.

³¹ German Raiffeisenverband, deputy secretary, May 27th 2003; Consortium of farmers (Arbeitsgemeinschaft bäuerliche Landwirtschaft), secretary general, May 13th 2003

³² Union (Deutscher Gewerkschaftsbund), Secretary for EU affairs, April 17th 2003; Bundesverband Verbraucherzentrale, press officer, July 7th

³³ European Movement Germany (Europäische Bewegung Deutschland), Secretary General, August 22nd 2003; Bundesverband Verbraucherzentrale, press officer, July 7th 2003

³⁴ Bund für Umwelt- und Naturschutz, August 22nd 2003

³⁵ Euronatur, general secretary, June 2nd 2003

³⁶ Flüchtlingsrat Nordrheinwestphalen, August 12th 2003

³⁷ Türkische Gemeinde Deutschland, September 16th 2003

³⁸ Attac, June 3rd 2003

Interestingly, NGO actors do see EU integration as more problematic and facing more challenges compared to interest group actors. Three representatives raise major tasks that are decisive for the future of Europe. One of them is the common foreign and security policy³⁹, another challenge is the reform of the EU institutional structure after the enlargement⁴⁰ and finally an increase in the speed of political integration⁴¹. There are also those representatives who stress the problematic aspects of European integration. The vice-head of the political secretariat of the commission of the Catholic Church⁴² warns that regional specificities come short in European regulations and thus uniformisation occurs. A consultant of a regional refugee organisation⁴³ identifies another problem of the integration process: He claims, that national governments are trying to take away competences from the EU within the framework of subsidiarity. Most problems, he says, can better be solved on an EU level. Within the decision process of the EU, the EU consultant of PRO ASYL⁴⁴ says, the problem is that the smallest *denominator is the shaping factor*. This leads to a spiral of weakening standards. Thus he demands a stronger harmonisation, a stronger commission and a democratisation of the EU. A co-operator of a group supporting rejected asylum seekers⁴⁵ regards the integration process of the EU as very problematic: it will lower the standards of social security; culturally, it will split the people into those who exchange more and those who partition themselves from the rest; internationally, the EU will form a power block against the Third World.

ii. Evaluation of

a) European integration

Although NGO actors criticise the details of the process of European integration, they support the overall project of European integration per se by the majority. Approximately seven out of ten representatives agree more or less on the process of European integration. The commissioner of the protestant church⁴⁶ binds his agreement on the question whether it is possible in the future to conduct a peace policy that differs from the hegemonic model of US foreign policy. The consultant of PRO ASYL⁴⁷ generally supports the integration process but thinks that the process should move quicker and that the economic Union must be changed into a political one where topics are dealt with in the first pillar and clear competences are arranged in the Constitution. European integration suffers the problem, he claims, that nations become the possibility to export their 'small sins' to the EU and thus turn the EU into a scapegoat. Those who disagree with the process of European integration stress for example the economic logic behind the integration process. The representative of ATTAC⁴⁸ demands an alternative European integration where economic aspects are not the driving force. Also

³⁹ Europa-Union Deutschland, secretary general, May 13th 2003

⁴⁰ Protestant Church Berlin, Commissioner for Migrants, September 23rd 2003

⁴¹ Young European Federalists (Junge Europäische Föderalisten), deputy secretary, June 3rd 2003

⁴² Kommissariat der Deutschen Bischofskonferenz, August 21st 2003

⁴³ Flüchtlingsrat Nordrheinwestphalen, August 12th 2003

⁴⁴ PRO ASYL, July 3rd, 2003

⁴⁵ Kein Mensch ist illegal, June 30th 2003

⁴⁶ Protest Church, September 23rd 2003

⁴⁷ PRO ASYL, July 3rd, 2003

⁴⁸ Attac, June 3rd 2003

the consultant of the regional refugee organisation is unsatisfied with the process of European integration as it proceeds too slow. The press officer of an environmental organisation⁴⁹ criticises that Europe did not reject the Iraq war completely.

b) Role and performances of EU institutions

The performances of EU institutions are assessed partly positively and partly negatively. But most criticism regarding EU institutions is aimed at national governments. Four representatives claim that national institutions have blocked the EU integration process and that the main weakness of European institutions is their dependence from national actors.⁵⁰ They call it a system-immanent break for European integration as national decisions must always be taken into consideration. ATTAC⁵¹ in contrast criticises the bureaucratic character of EU institutions, mainly that of the EU commission. Some representatives differentiate their support and criticism according to the various institutions within the EU. The Young European Federalists⁵² for example support the supranational institutions whereas the intergovernmental ones are criticised. An environmental organisation⁵³ wants the European Parliament to be strengthened, whereas the in-transparent Commission should lose power.

⁴⁹ Bund für Umwelt- und Naturschutz, August 22nd 2003

⁵⁰ see: Young European Federalists (Junge Europäische Föderalisten), June 3rd, 2003; regional refugee organisation (Flüchtlingsrat Nordrheinwestphalen), August 12th 2003; Turkish community in Germany (Türkische Gemeinde Deutschland), September 16th 2003; environmental organisation (Bund für Umwelt- und Naturschutz), August 22nd 2003

⁵¹ Attac, June 3rd 2003

⁵² Young European Federalists (Junge Europäische Föderalisten), June 3rd, 2003

⁵³ Euronatur, June 2nd 2003