

**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: **Delphi**  
WP Coordinator: Paul Statham  
Deliverable number: **D 6.5**

Report **National case report of Delphi analysis**

Case report **Italy**

---

Author: Donatella della Porta

Date: 21 April 2004

**Italian National Delphi Report  
Political and Media Actors' Visions of the Future of Europe**

<b>I.</b>	<b>Analytic Summary</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>II.</b>	<b>General Overview</b>	<b>6</b>
Table 1	Actors' perceptions on whether European integration contributed to specific developments in the European region	6
<b>III.</b>	<b>Detailed Analysis of Actors' Perceptions</b>	<b>7</b>
<i>i.</i>	<i>State actors</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>ii.</i>	<i>Political parties</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>iii.</i>	<i>Interest groups</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>iv.</i>	<i>NGOs</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>v.</i>	<i>Media actors</i>	<i>18</i>
	<b>Bibliographical references</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Appendix 1</b>	<b>List of interviewees and interview dates</b>	<b>22</b>

## I. Analytic Summary

This report focuses on the evaluation of the process of European integration by state actors, political parties, interest groups, NGOs and social movement organizations, as well as journalists. If traditional theories about the European integration as driven by national economic interests provided little space for the role of national debates on European issues, the emergence of constructivist theories in international relations and well as institutional analysis of Europeanization paid more and more attention to the way in which national actors perceive and define the process, both in descriptive and normative ways. Moreover, acknowledging the role of multi-level governance, comparative politics started to cover the effects of European integration on national political system. If however there is more and more agreement about the multilevel nature of policy-making, opinions diverge greatly about the impact of European integration on national politics (Hix and Goetz 2001). Supranational institutions change the structure of claim-making (Bartolini 1998), but the presence of “nested games” and multilevel processes contributed to depoliticise the issue of Europeanization, that seems to be debated especially in those arena that have less decisional power over European issues (Mair 2001, 47). The analysis of the positions of various national actors about the EU can contribute to this stream of research.

Additionally, the analysis of the attitudes of various national actors about Europe acquires a specific relevance as far as the Italian case is concerned. There is in fact a consensus about the strong Europhilia tendencies of the Italian political actors—especially after the European turn of the Italian Communist Party (PCI) in the seventies. However, especially more recently, this enthusiasm for European integration was shaken by such developments as the disappearance of the Christian Democratic party, with an ideological support for Europe, and the emergence of either mildly European (Forza Italia) or Euro-sceptic parties (such as the League, and traditionally the right-wing Alleanza Nazionale), as well as the increasing criticism of some EU choices by the far left Rifondazione comunista. In fact, in a comparative analysis of the 15 EU party systems, Italy scored first in terms of percentage of votes for strongly anti-European integration parties (Mair 2001, 32).

The result of our research confirms, first of all, support for European integration but within extremely varied conceptions of Europe. Europe emerged in fact as an “imagined community” that meant very different things to different collective actors. In part, the differentiation overlapped with the traditional distinction between Europe as an economic enterprise, based upon the pragmatic support in nation-state, and instead Europe as a federation based upon a common destiny and common values, with a particular commitment to peaceful interaction. If these two images reflect the traditional tension between the two motivations that supported the very first step of the integration process—economic competition with the US economy and fear of a new and catastrophic conflict—in our research they appear as developing in time. In particular, the economic approach face the challenge of a globalizing economy, with a shift from protectionism to neoliberalism, and the more political rational has to face the

emphasis on diversity as a positive value that characterizes (post)modern, contemporary cultural turns.

This also has an effect in terms of the interaction between the issue of European integration and the traditional Left-Right cleavage. If some scholars suggested in the beginning an overlapping between pro-anti European stances and position on the Left-right axes (with the first pioneering research by Haas 1958, stressing support for Europe more at the right and the moderate Left), our research indicate instead a missing overlap between support for Europe and position on the more traditional cleavages. In fact, first of all, criticisms to existing Europe came from both the Left and Right—the former criticising the dominance of the market, the latter the increasing politicisation of the EU. However, even for those who considered European integration as a positive trend, rightwing actors stressed economic interests and efficiency, while leftwing one stressed identity building and solidarity. Left and Right seems relevant categories for reading, if not the degree of support for the EU, at least the preferred image of Europe, with the Left focusing on regulated capitalism and the Right on neoliberalism (Hooge and Marks 2002; Marx and Steggenberg 2002; Hooge et al. 2002).

The research confirmed also a different type of investment on the issue of European integration, with a pragmatic approach on the Right, and a split between ideological full-support and soft-ideological scepticism on the Left. Referring to the typology developed by Conti and Verzichelli (forthcoming) we have on the Right examples of “soft Euro scepticism” (not principled objection but criticism on some issues) to functional Europeanism (strategic support for national economic interest); on the Left, from “soft Euro scepticism” to “identity Europeanism” (as principled support to the EU). Notwithstanding this split, left-wing actors tended to stress an image of the EU-to-be as supranational, with particular sympathies (or less hostility) towards the Parliament, an heterogeneous judgment upon the Commission (also influenced by the Prodi Presidency), while right-wing actors were more likely to support the intergovernmental Council.

Last but not least, the research confirmed different images about the institutional assets of the future EU. Crossing opinions about the transfer of competences and those about the transfer of sovereignty, Diez Medrano (2003, 71) suggested four models of European integration: Decentralized cooperation, decentralized integration, centralized cooperation and centralized integration. All these different models have been mentioned by our interview partners. If most actors mentioned the “democratic deficit”, it was especially the “critical Left” that stressed the need of a bottom-up process of development of a European politics, strongly stigmatising the actual top-down model. Even in this case, however, scepticism addressed the actual EU institutions, not the idea of a “Europe of the citizens”, that instead was supported as part of the construction of supranational network and global multicultural identity. Whatever the desired direction for Europe, there is large consensus on the contingent difficulties created by such challenges as enlargement, but also the Iraq war.

The mentioned preoccupations are very strongly expressed by the State actors, mainly part of the right-wing coalition in government. Especially enlargement is perceived as an economic challenged, especially for a country that had received in the past EU economic support for the underdeveloped regions. The positions of the various actors

seems however also influenced by the specificity of the Italian politics—with a desire to sign the Constitutional Treaty during the Italian Semester, but at the same time also the tension with the head of the Commission (and of the Italian opposition), Romano Prodi, as well as the contingent conflict between Berlusconi and the European Parliament. All these elements could have played a particularly important impact on parties characterized (such as Forza Italia and, more recently, Alleanza Nazionale) by a pragmatic attitude of mild support to European integration. Enlargement is clearly perceived by the governmental actors as mainly an alternative to the deepening of the European integration.

Among the political parties, confirming some hypotheses present in the literature on party politics, “peripheral” parties emerged as more critical of the EU, while instead no role was played by the position in government (Szczerbiak and Taggart 2002). Moreover, as in other European countries (Gabel and Hix 2002), left-wing parties became more supportive of European integration than right-wing ones. The heir of the larger part of the former PCI, the Democratici di Sinistra (DS) are the only force that, with their strong and a-priori support for integration (identity Europeanism, according to Conti and Verzichelli forthcoming), does not perceive enlargement as jeopardising a deepening of the EU. Additionally, the traditional attention to Eastern Europe seem to fuel optimistic expectation about the success of the enlargement, with a quick and not painful development of the new entrances. On the Right, it is especially the economic risk of the enlargement that is most feared, and the impact of contingent concerns is strengthened by a position of “functional Europeanism” or even “soft Euro scepticism. On the Left, criticism addresses instead what is perceived as the survival of the economic nature of European integration, linked with an idea of Europe as part of the Western world and stressing Western values. The stability pact is attacked as a main example of neoliberalist economic policies that privilege the already most privileged groups and reduce the welfare protection for the poor or less advantaged. However, there is not a demand to go back to the nation-state, but instead a support for a bottom-up process of Europeanization.

The idea of an economic Europe is deeply rooted among economic interest groups (Falkner 2001). Also in this case, enlargement is in fact perceived as an economic risk, and the representatives we interviewed confirmed their single-issue concern for specific policy area, without much reflection upon the institutional assets of the European Union. The general attention paid to the role of the Commission seem to confirm the important role that pluralistic networks play at the European level, with privileged relationship with the said organism. However, confirming also large differences in the style of policy network at the EU level, especially the actors involved in the issue of immigration express instead a support for a more political image of Europe, for a European role as peaceful integration of different culture, and advocate more solidarity.

The latter position is especially supported by social movement organizations that are the most critical of the process of European integration, perceived indeed as economically driven. Although expressing support for the building of a European level of citizenship, they strongly stigmatise the policy choices of the EU institutions as privileging the market upon the people. Especially movement organizations active on migration issue criticize the building of a “European fortress” and the lack of recognition of migrant’s social and political rights. Low concern with social rights is,

by the way, considered as the characteristic of EU policies also towards the general citizenry. The need of building a supranational level of governance is recognized (see also della Porta 2003), but the lack of accountability and transparency of the EU institutions is stigmatised.

As for the position of the journalists, all the mentioned topics are covered with varying degree of pessimism for the actual moment of stalemate in the process of European integration. Confirming some effects of Europeanization on the structuration of European media (Semetko, de Vreese and Peter 2001), the foreign correspondents we interviewed expressed the more positive expectations about European integration while Italy-based journalists seemed more sceptical about the relevance of a supranational level of governance. Maybe as an effect of the larger attention to supranational issue, quality newspapers seemed somewhat more interested in EU issues than regional ones. The more centre-left oriented La Repubblica converged moreover with the tradition of Euro-philia of the Italian moderate Left, while more criticism was voiced by journalists of more right-right newspapers. Most of our interviewed converged however in their consideration of a critical moment for the EU and the concern for the institution-building as a crucial necessity especially face to the challenges of the enlargement.

## II. General Overview

Table 1, below, gives us an overall impression of how different actors perceive the contribution of European integration to the region. Interviewees were asked whether the process of European integration contributed to six specific developments in Europe: peace and security, political stability, economic growth, economic competitiveness, environmental protection, and social equality. Where they gave a positive response, their score was recorded as 3; where they claimed European integration ‘partly’ contributed, the score was 1.5; and where they said that European integration did not contribute to that development, the score recorded was 0. Aggregate scores for all actor types are shown in Table 1.

**Table 1 Actors’ perceptions on whether European Integration contributes to specific developments in the European region**

	<b>ALL</b>	State Actors	Parties	Interest Groups	NGOs	Journalists
1. Security	2.2	2.4	2	2.5	2.1	2.4
2. Political stability	2.2	2.3	2.1	2.3	2.1	2.5
3. Economic growth	2.2	2.4	2	2.2	1.9	2.4
4. Economic competitiveness	2.1	2.4	2	2.1	2.1	2.5
5. Environmental protection	0.9	2.1	2.1	2	1.9	2.4
6. Social equality	2	2.4	2.1	2	1.7	2.1
<b>ALL</b>	2.1	2.3	2	2.1	1.9	2.4
N	65	11	11	14	13	16

Media actors emerge as the actor type most likely to argue that European integration has contributed positively to developments in Europe, followed closely by state actors.

NGOs and party actors are less convinced than other types of actors that European integration contributes to positive political, economic and social developments in Europe, with an average score 1.9- 2.0.

Italian interest groups representatives are careful regarding whether European integration could be said to contribute strongly to developments in Europe: they positively evaluate the process of European integration in terms of political consequences, as well as, even at a lesser extent, in terms of economic consequences. However, they have some doubts concerning social aspects.

### **III. Detailed Analysis of Actors Perceptions**

This part of the report focuses on the results of our Delphi questions. Our partners were asked to respond in depth about their expectations and normative statement about the future perspective of the EU. All respondents were asked about their general perceptions on the process of European integration, their evaluation of this process and their value judgment about the role and performance of EU institutions in this context . We comment below upon the results of this part of the questionnaire with 11 state actors, 11 party actors, 14 interest groups representatives and 13 Social Movement organizations. For what concerns media and journalists, we interviewed: 4 Home Affair Correspondents, 4 EU correspondents, 4 Agriculture Correspondents, 4 Directors/Editors (see list in appendix 1).

#### **i. State actors**

Italian institutional actors have been traditionally considered as particularly Europhiliac. Not only Italy was part of the founding countries of the Rome Treaty, but also Europeanization has been often perceived as a direction of “normalization” of Italian anomalies (Giuliani 2000). During the period of our interviews there were however also some specific conditions that have to be taken into account in evaluating the responses to our questions. First of all, the President of the European Commission, Romano Prodi, was not only an Italian, but also the main representative of the Olive Coalition, which is in the opposition of the Italian political system. Moreover, there was the peculiarity of the “Italian semester”, with the Italian Prime Minister, Silvio Berlusconi, with a particular visibility in the European Council. This peculiar constellation made tended to “Italianise” European matters.

The institutional actors are cautious about the future perspective of the European integration. In particular, the enlargement is “bipartisanly” perceived as a challenging decision, and the failure to sign the Convention as an indicator of a strong tensions between the required steps towards more sovereignty to EU institutions and the increase in the number of states involved, in a period characterized by, not only economic, difficulties. According to an Italian (centre - left) deputy at the Convention

(570), “Today the process of European integration seems to be in a phase of stalemate, it seems to have stopped because the constitution is not passed and ratified. ...Many states strongly oppose delegating real powers to EU. It's crazy to do the enlargement to 25 countries without constitution!”

But there is also the perception of a political crisis. The impression of a turning point is confirmed by the Italian Foreign Affairs Ministry: DG Immigration and Italian communities abroad (571): “The European integration is the only road that can be followed in the future. Today it is true that the EU construction is at a turning point, with much narrower options than for previous turning points. Today the big jump is that of sovereignty, and here we need to overcome the problem of the political Europe, otherwise we risk the stalemate, and eventually a regression. If the constitution will pass as it is, if we succeed in doing a foreign politics and common defence, they will be important steps”. The stalemate in the signature of the convention is in fact related to the uncertainty about the “model of Europe we want”. As our interviewee from the Italian Foreign Affairs Ministry: DG European Integration (572) declared, with (moderate) optimism, “There is today a text (of the Convention) in which the almost totality of the matters have been explained, agreements have been made (apart for the fact that the UK is always too much anti Europeist!). On security and defence, Italy has done a good job in mediating a solution at the Convention and this it is already a step. The text of the Convention is there waiting to be approved. Only three points must be still solved: ... but they have not been because of a delicate political picture, still made of breakings and grudges among the states”.

Concern there is also about the development of EU legislation in new policy areas. In particular, our interviewee at the Italian Labour and Social Affairs Ministry (now Welfare Ministry) (566) stated that “European politics on the immigration will be successful and be easy to implement on social and contractual themes, but it will be more difficult to implement as far as the flows of entry are concerned, because it will be awkward to apply a unique rule for Europe. EU indications have to hold in consideration the national specificities of the member countries with zones at risk of landing of migrants.”

Looking at the possible results of the crisis, some have the impression that the moment of tension can bring about a retrenchment in the integration process. Even those who are in favour of the Constitutional Treaty fear the revival of nation-states support for an intergovernmental model of EU integration. Our interviewee in the Italian Foreign Affairs Ministry, DG Immigration and Italian communities abroad (565), stated that “We are extremely favourable to the draft of the constitutional Treaty as it has been elaborated: it has a solid base. On the various substantive themes addressed in the draft there is agreement! But merely to defend their national affairs, some member states didn't accept a majority rather than to unanimity procedure in the EU Council and therefore the treaty has not been approved. It doesn't mean however that the whole general plan and the indications on policies must be changed. We are in favour of a majority vote. I don't agree to discuss the EU future anew, putting again in discussion the whole plan of the Constitution. I'm instead in favour of a good institutional equilibrium among Commission, Parliament and Council, with more power to the Parliament”. The dilemma about the model of European integration, with a sort of return to an intergovernmental model, is also stressed by our interviewee in the Italian Agriculture Ministry (574), who observed, “Until five, six years ago they spoke of reaching a European federation. Something has now changed, they speak

more and more of an intergovernmental model in which national states remain subjects and that in certain areas surrender some sovereignty to EU. There are two different conceptions: a federal one; a non-federal one. It's difficult to say which one will prevail. In the economical matters, we have succeeded in obtaining the common market while defence, foreign politics are still prerogatives of the national states. I don't know if we will succeed in having a European army, a foreign common politics.”

Opinions split also about the possible solution to the stalemate. One solution is technocratic, with more specialization and “simpler instruments”. According to the Italian Ministry for Communitarian (EU) Politics (Legislative Office) (526) confirms the awareness of the need to meet enlargement with new energies and skills: “The future EU parliamentary elections will be a very important moment. The direction the process has taken is very good, although the reception of this direction isomer and more complicated and more and more specialization is necessary. A market widened to 25 countries needs more transparent and simple instruments, but also specialization. Much work is necessary to create an harmonic European terrain”. In a similar direction, a decentralization of decision-making is proposed. The Italian Agriculture Ministry (DG for Rural Development politics) (521) fears that “it is uncertain if the actual composition of the Commission could survive the enlargement. The best system to be able to manage such a complex phase is the decentralization of some decisional aspects of actual political administrations”.

Euro-enthusiasts however still see a necessary expansion of integration—as part of a self-fuelling process. The representative of the Italian Parliament (Camera Deputati) in the Agriculture Commission (573), for the opposition party Rifondazione Comunista, believes, for instance, that “If it has a limit, the process of integration is too slow. We need a stronger EU, or there will be severe complications. When there is scepticism from national governments, and the EU has no defined powers, the European performance risks to pull back too. It is the risk that emerged last year. If we do not sign the Constitution, if EU institutions do not recognize new real powers, we will have just the organism that governs with rigidity economic policies and that now risks exploding. EU institutions have performed well when they have been called to act for instance on the Euro, on the common agricultural politics. The problem is that they are conditioned by the governments in the attribution of powers. However I see a positive perspective because there are no alternatives to the integration. The world cannot be governed unilaterally”. And the development of the integration process is linked to the strengthening of the European Parliament. According to an Italian (centre-left) deputy at the Convention (570) “In my opinion the Eu Parliament will have to play a fundamental role in exiting from this impasse; the national parliaments are more courageous than governments in giving sovereignty to EU. I am not at all optimist if I think about the future, facing the enlargement is not possible, we can't manage it!”.

There is moreover the perception of the need to involve the public opinion in the process, of creating a European identity. Some however perceive that this will be possible by stressing, in a traditional way, the economic advantages of the enterprise. According to the Italian Ministry for Communitarian (EU) Politics (Legislative Office) (526), “It's necessary to demonstrate to the normal citizen the centrality of EU culture and teach them that with the enlargement a new and larger market will come.

Citizens begin to look to the EU institutions not as enemies but as institutions that can intervene in a secure way (with the certainty of the law)". Also the Italian Agriculture Ministry (DG for Rural Development politics) (521) stresses the "perception of a maximum sharing of the integration process, of its political importance, of the stability and the economic growth".

The Constitutional process opens a window of opportunity in the direction of an involvement of the public opinion, which however some believe was not fully exploited. According to the Italian Ministry for Communitarian (EU) Politics (First Private Secretary Vicar, President of Observatory for the Convention) (525): "People starts to be aware of the existence of European integration and this means immediately an acceleration, when on newspapers the conscience that something exists emerges. In the beginning of the work of the Convention, we paid the lack of a text of reference and therefore the theme of the integration remained distant from people, from media. The visibility has however increased with the passage from the Giscard d'Estaing's draft of the Constitution to the Intergovernmental Conference. The presence of so many heads of state gave a precise direction toward the Constitution. After the Convention some powers or institutions have increased their visibility and some have reduced them. EU Commission was attacked in her role as unique guarantor. European Parliament has improved a little bit its position."

## **ii. Political Parties**

Italian political parties have been traditionally, with very few exceptions, in favour of European integration. The motivations for this have been different, however, and contingent shifts emerged in the position of some parties.

If in the past the Christian democratic party had played a pivotal role in the support for European integration (Bull 1996; Walker 1976), the new centre-right parties are however less committed to the issue, with moreover a strong fluctuation in the position of one of the coalition partners, the League—that starting from support to the idea of a Europeanisation, ended up as the more explicitly anti-EU party in Italy.

The strongest centre-right party, Forza Italia, sees the EU as an opportunity for Italian national interests as well as international prestige. Also Alleanza Nazionale (AN) (National Responsible Immigration Politics) (524) points at the economic advantage of European integration: "Integration is too important to compete in globalise world not with single economies or single state affairs, but in a big project of broad political and economic consent". Although AN has been perceived as "protectionist", also AN National Responsible Immigration Politics) (524) stresses a "neoliberalist" image of Europe, in particular in terms of free trade: "The problem is to realize them and there is a certain difficulty and rigidity in the protectionist politics and in lobbies and nationalistic affairs.

Within this instrumental approach to Europe, enlargement is risky, especially for a country that had enjoyed in the past a large flux of EU money for cohesion programs. One of the representatives of Forza Italia (FI) (569) we interviewed expresses fears about the risks of the enlargement. "I was not in favour of the enlargement before the deepening. I understand the expectations of the candidate countries to enter in EU. In first phase the enlargement can serve as factor of pressure to obtain the result of the

deepening. Every time the EU has taken a step forward, it has done it because it was forced to, without alternatives”. Also AN National Responsible Immigration Politics) (524) pushes for a more cautious process of integration: “we have to avoid accelerations, keeping a Europe with a varying geometry, with strengthened cooperation ...”.

Rightwing parties also ask for a “reduced bureaucracy” and “more technical efficacy”. As the AN National Responsible for Immigration Politics (524) stated, “It’s necessary to reduce European bureaucracy therefore to create a better synergy between Commission, Parliament and Council EU to make the process easier and adaptable”. This should however go hand in hand with more specialization in the EU personnel. The lack of centrality of a EU career is stigmatised by a representative of Forza Italia (FI) (569): “Italy is wrong not to insert managerial figures in EU at the level of Parliament and high officials. Italians consider the EU as ‘cemetery of the elephants’, a premium at the end of a career”.

Confirming a low salience of Europeanization issue for the domestic party system, differences emerge also within right-wing parties in their image of future EU institutions, and even within the same party. Alleanza Nazionale (AN) (Member of Foreign Affairs Parliament Commission at the Camera) (510) strongly supports enlargement: “AN is favourable to the integration of the candidate countries and even of Turkey, for a greater equilibrium between North and Mediterranean. In this sense AN is favourable to the birth of the Mediterranean Bank connected to the North Africa”. Forza Italia (FI) (569) expects that “Integration goes more and more toward the strengthening of the executive power.” The Alleanza Nazionale (AN) (Member of Foreign Affairs Parliament Commission at the Camera) (510) is instead more optimistic about the future role of the European Parliament: “The Parliament is in a limbo, but then it will have more powers and in comparison to it the national parties will lose more and more power”

On the Left, after a turning point in the Seventies (Walker 1976; Sbragia 2001), the PCI and then the Democratici di sinistra (DS) express the strongest trust in the European integration. The DS representatives are very optimistic about the enlargement, perceived as a confirmation of the “tendency towards integration” and the good functioning of an integrated market. According to the Democratici di sinistra (DS) (Responsible of Agriculture Sector) (555), “the enlargement is resource toward integration and the improvement in the situation of the poorest countries. Once we have overcome the initial difficulties, we need now to move towards a positive integration: competition within an integrated frame pushes the less developed countries towards the levels of the most advanced ones, therefore there is a general improvement for the whole union. There is this development towards the better positions, not only at the EU level, but also at the national one.”

The DS (Responsible of European Integration and Integration politics) (522) is also optimistic about the work of the Convention: “We would like a more autonomous role for Italy! But the Convention was extraordinary under many respects; in particular, in building consensus between its four institutional elements on a unique common project”, although recognizing a decline in the public opinion support for the process: “The difficulty of the interactions during the Conference was linked to the emergence

of negative positions of public opinion toward the new necessary developments of European Integration”.

A characteristic of the left-wing supporters for integration vis-à-vis the right-wing supporters is the emphasis of the former on “identity issues”. The DS stresses, within an identity frame, the need that “Italy, as a founding country of Europe, carries on with its Europeanist tradition”, calling for a “common commitment of all Europeanist forces in Italy” (DS responsible of European Integration and Integration politics 522).

The model of EU integration chosen is a supranationalist one, with strong support for the Parliament. The Democratici di sinistra (DS)(Responsible of Agriculture Sector) (555) wishes a larger role for the more “supranational” institutions: “a greater power for the Commission and the Parliament and a Council easier to manage”, since “the Commission has the more advanced vision, the Parliament has interesting positions; the Council slows down the process due to the elements of national politics opposing the integration.”

Also critical attitudes differ on the Left and on the Right. On the Right, the Lega (504) is very critical of the “democratic deficit of democracy of the community institutions”, but also of “hyper regulation”: “the interference of the UE in many aspects of daily life (ex: alimentary productions)”. The EU is depicted as “more and more controlled by bureaucracies and distant from the feelings of the people... distant from the public”, blaming “the lack of political and mediatic debate on these topics” that reduces the information about the European issues. Initially asking for a “federative” Europe of the Regions, the League became more and more negative towards EU integration. The enlargement is perceived as an “acceleration without considering some problems of assimilability of the member countries”, with growing problems. Against the “excessive power of the EU institutions”, the League plans to promote a proposal of referendum on many EU treaties”.

Criticisms from the Left of the political spectrum address the “democratic deficit”, but also more specifically the policy choices of the EU, in particular the prevalence of neoliberal policies and the lack of “solidarity policies”. Rifondazione Comunista (RC) (Responsible of Agriculture Sector) (515) criticises, first of all, the top-down pattern of integration: “The construction of the European Union comes from the top and there is no low level, except for the movements that attempt at influencing ‘high polics’ ... RC is for a “bottom up” Europe”. The EU institutions, with the only exception of the Parliament, are criticized for their not being elective: “ECB, Commission, Council... are structures without democratic order. The Constitution itself is a failure because it proceeds from the top down”. Also according to Rifondazione Comunista (513) (Responsible Settore Immigrazione), “the EU Parliament. Should win dignity and succeed in providing directions, because now it is providing only the appearance of democracy. Now, all is wrongly based on intergovernmental directives”.

It is however not Europe that is rejected, but the specific EU policies. In the word of Rifondazione Comunista (RC) (513) (Responsible of Immigration Sector), “The idea of Europeanism has been betrayed. There should be a Europe for the people, based upon a multi-centred culture, and not an identity based upon a Europe that does not exist, or upon passed glories, that are however not so many”. Europe should also defend peace instead than making war: “While UE thinks of getting an army, RC

thinks about a pacifist UE. RC rejects the hypothesis of a strong alliance with the USA, with the strategy of an imperial power”. In this direction, the suggestion is “to look at the Mediterranean area instead at the USA. The EU together with Africa and Middle East could build something of a higher cultural level and more peaceful”. Moreover, according to Rifondazione Comunista (RC) (Responsible of Agriculture Sector) (515), “This Europe liberalizes more and more the movement of trade and doubtful capitals, but not of the people. It condemns to death thousand of citizens with its restrictive laws on immigration” (ibid.). Immigration policies are among the most criticized. According to Rifondazione Comunista (RC) (513) (Responsible of Immigration Sector), “About immigration and asylum, with the enlargement, the EU will become more and more rigid. EU will become more and more a fortress, and this is bad.”

### **iii. Interest groups**

A Left-Right cleavage is visible—as in the Italian tradition of interest groups linked to parties by “clienteles and parenthood”—also in the system of functional representation. Among interest organizations, an instrumental attitude towards Europe as economically advantageous enterprises largely prevails, even though support for Europe as a cultural resource for people integration and peace is emerging especially among organizations active in the field of immigration. Also for interest groups, if there is a general tradition of consensus to European integration, criticism is however growing.

The representatives of small-enterprises interests in general support Europe as an economically successful enterprise. The agricultural association Coldiretti (554) supports the enlargement: “Integration is positive ... Difficulties are enormous but the idea is of a protagonist Europe. A fundamental role plays the agriculture. It's a slow process. But it should be a democratic Europe! A strong Europe is important in the international negotiations, for instance in Cancun, but respecting the differences. It should be endowed of a greater coefficient of democracy and transparency”.

Interest groups tend to focus on single issues and an instrumental vision of the EU. For instance, the representative of the artisan association Confartigianato (520), stresses that his organization “avoids taking position on a lot of things and if they do not affect themes that concern it”. Also the position towards the future of European integration stresses that different institutional settings should be maintained for different matters “Some sovereign power must be maintained, simple majority only is not possible, although first pillar would have to be completely with simple majority”. The shopkeepers association Confcommercio (508), welcoming the role of the Commission as “the motor of the UE” (and whose power will be strengthened by the reform), stresses that “Some different methods of work will be necessary (it is difficult that in the enlarged UE every country has the same value)”.

The interest groups that have been traditionally more oriented to the Left also express a steady support for integration, but still stressing the economic advantages of the EU. The representative of the CNA (Responsible of Immigration Sector) (511) points at the economic potential of the enlargement, even if considering the necessity of good

institutions, able to exploit this potential: "It is important to think well the institutional frame to build in order to face the future challenges in a more and more integrated EU, especially after enlargement. Europe can be considered as the instrument to facilitate the development of new candidate countries to develop themselves, by using their economic strengths. It's not possible to think to European integration without considering the pressing on Europe east European and African countries".

However, there is also the perception that enlargement could jeopardize economic success. As the representative of Confagricoltura (506) told us: "It's a great project, a dream of centuries that is now realized with notable speed. Perhaps a more gradual process, with areas of free exchange as social dampers to the enlargement of the EU, would have been a more realistic project and would have created less problems". There is, in particular, the fear that "In Italy, the dualism North - South is increasing, and if this problem is not addressed before the enlargement, there will be many problems. Moreover, it is necessary to consider the general crisis of the economy: if there will be economic development, then the enlargement will be positive. The EU Commission has taken a big step forward on the enlargement and liberalization of the markets, but it couldn't manage it. Its myopia is the cause of its failure that everybody can see".

Besides the "economic Europe", there is however also some emerging support for the role the EU can play in the building of a tolerant culture. More concerned with the interaction among peoples and cultures, the representative of the Conferenza Episcopale Italiana (509), perceives enlargement to the east as positive, even if there is the "danger of a nationalistic involution and the fluctuation of political choices that seem to be determined by the opportunism of single parties". In a similar direction, the Crocerossa (507), although believing that "the opening of the frontiers can be a positive thing, in particular in term of the spread of information about and acceptance of immigrant", stigmatises the fact that "The institutions are distant from the concrete reality". Also the representative of the confederational union CISL (562) also mentions economic success, together with the other traditional frame of European integration, peace: "Integration is a process that links the themes of economic growth and the world safety (above all as far as peace is concerned). European institutions are working in this direction. We are in favour of the Constitutional Paper, even if it is badly written in some points".

For some, problems are created by the limited integration. Here as well, however, there are differences in the stress upon economic interests or a larger conception of integration. Traditionally near to the Left, the Cna (Responsible "European Integration" office) (517) stresses the need to "reflect upon the institutional picture that will be built to face the future challenges in a more and more integrated EU. The EU has to implement herself a model of governance...A more political EU is necessary: it has to work better to let the enterprises understand the opportunities that are in EU. The theory of the competition must be accompanied by other community politics in other sectors (as in the fiscal system). The communitarian dimension of politics is still constrained by the national ones', that don't want to accept the existence of a common destiny. And today, national politics are inadequate for the economy and for the enterprises. More common and centralized institutions are necessary. The EU institutional reforms that are discussed today will have to foresee a Europe with a varying geometry, so that those who are ahead can make more

courageous steps forward. The Italian politics is not able to address this communitarian dimension; the debate in Italy is still too national ... For enterprises this is important. It's necessary to take back the Lisbon philosophy on the competitiveness. The national governments united in the Council must take the road of the *concertazione* and bring to the EU the demands of the small and medium enterprises; otherwise we risk losing whole productive systems. UE is not made of big enterprises only". As the representatives of the Ds, also the Cgil (561) expresses "full trust in the process of European integration beyond political cleavages", and stresses that "European dimension is to be reevaluated: it acquires more and more importance in all the aspects of the politics and the Cgil is in favour of this evolution".

For others, integration should especially consist of the strengthening of the fields of intervention where weaker interests are to be supported. For the consumers, Adiconsum (551) suggests that Europe should take up competences in new domains: "Integration is still tame, even with the new Constitution. The powers of the Commission are still limited. There should be more areas under exclusive EU competence (defence, public revenues, job policies). I am in favour of a greater integration; we wish a greater speed in the integration". Even the representative of the Conferenza Episcopale Italiana (509), the Italian bishops, stresses that "The Convention as it is today it is fine, even if it does not mention in the Preamble Christianity. It is good also for the immigration but it has the defect to look too much at the regularization of the clandestine immigration and fluxes and to give too little consideration to solidarity issue".

The unions and the consumer associations also express some criticism about the specific developments Europe is taking. Talking for the FLAI-CGIL (556), one of our interviewees expresses his concern for identity-building, even if not excluding economic concern: "We are in favour of Europe of the citizens. It's important that Europe assumes real dimension of United States of Europe to speak at the same level with China, USA, Brazil and Merconsur. European presidency does well to push for a constitution, while the Right-wing governments are only concerned with the Economic Europe". According to the CIA (553), "Integration is not good, it does not pay attention to general policies such as common defence, budget, frontiers, labour. We need an effort by the institutions to make the citizen understand who makes what and to distinguish national competences from those of the European institutions". The Acli (567) stress that "there is a lot to do for the social security laws, the social and political rights and of representation".

#### **iv. NGOs and social movement organizations**

In general, NGOs share instead an identitarian approach to Europe. The NGOs are the more critical of the directions of the European integration—although, also in this case, not on the basis of traditional Euro-scepticism and defence of the nation-state, but more because of the specific directions of EU political decisions.

Within this identity-building approach, some NGOs expressed their fear for the uncertainty of the Constitutional process. Traditionally near to the Italian Communist Party, and very active in the advocacy of migrants rights, Arci (559) expresses

disappointment for the fact that “The Constitution denies a European dimension to all areas except for the already Europeanised sectors. It's a step backward”. Also the AICRE (Italian Association of “Comuni” and Regions) (512) expresses the fear that “The EU could remain paralysed after the defeat of the Convention. If the EU doesn't work in 15, it won't even work in 25 and therefore the crucial aspect of the veto must be solved on the base of the development of a federal model. The position in favour of strengthened Cooperation can be supported, but the way of the Convention must be taken back”. The CIR\_Onlus (560) talks of a “counter reform in comparison to the first years after the Amsterdam Treaty: systematically all the directives let a wider space to the national states. But this tendency won't last for a long time. Harmonization is positive, but not toward the bottom”.

Many NGOs take indeed strong positions for a deepening of the integration process. As expected, this is the case of the European Federalist Movement – Italy (501) whose representative considers “The EU Constitution as a big step forward, but insufficient because it maintains the veto power, in every difficult situation a division between, say, France and the UK, would block Europe”. The model proposed is instead “a federalism of the differences. It doesn't mean to destroy nations, but to do at the European level what cannot be done anymore at the national level.” More “Europe” is perceived by the President of the European Federalist Movement – Italy (501) as a response to globalisation: “After September 11 the change of paradigm is clear for everybody: we passed from the national perspective to the cosmopolitan one (that it is the only one that allows to understand what happens around us). By now the local and the global level are tightly correlated and interconnected. To think globally and to act locally is not enough; it is also necessary to act globally if we want that our actions at local level is meaningful”.

Especially associations near to the centre-left support without hesitation the European integration. The representative of the environmentalist Legambiente (557) stresses that “Enlargement is important. It brings about security for all: peace, job and food safety. Legambiente is favourable to the integration, but without reducing the interactions, especially toward the Mediterranean countries. European institutions are too timid.”

A more critical voice towards the EU institution comes instead from the more Left oriented movement organizations. Here as well, there is criticism for a process perceived as strongly top-down. The direction taken with the Constitution is considered as negative as “It misses an open dialogue. The process of European integration represents a step backward in comparison to the Italian and French constitutions”. For the representative of the network of associations active on global justice issue, Rete Lilliput (564), “We are favourable to the process of integration but we don't agree with the political direction is taking now. The political direction of this integration is not shared by Lilliput”. For Altroconsumo (519), “European integration is an irreversible process. But it focuses on very general themes without directly addressing the life of citizens and consumers, for whom it is difficult to judge if to annex Turkey or not, if it is better to accelerate or to slow down the process of integration.”

But criticism is also addressed towards the concrete policy choice, first of all the weak concern for social equality. The representative of the alternative union Cobas (505)

told us: “I disagree with the direction of the process of integration because it is primarily an economic, a financial one. It is not integration by popular consultation. It does not take the best from national constitutions, but it goes to the rebate. The Eu considers social services as not compulsory, job as optional for the citizen, it doesn't take any position on the war, doesn't guarantee to migrants it the same rights as to the commodities”. The Cospa (Spontaneous Committees of Agriculture producers) (502) also criticized the weak reference to values of solidarity and peace: “Let's start with the Treaty of Rome in 1960. The fathers of Europe had a precise idea, which is missing today. Today they quarrel on votes, on power positions, and not on the most important principles, which should be at heart of EU. The leading principles (of the founding fathers) have been lost, and besides it has not been achieved what common people want: job, security, and peace. Today the EU community is becoming a struggle between the groups of interest and power”. Even if in favour of the enlargement, Wwf (558) expresses concerns about “how to integrate the new member states from an environmental and territorial point of view. Environmental standards are there very low. There is therefore the need of big economic and cultural investments. We are going in the correct direction but there is insufficient economic support and the process is not fast enough”.

In all these cases, the criticism is not addressed to the building of a European level, but to the specific direction it has taken. For Comunità di Sant'Egidio (563), if “integration is a positive phenomenon! In this process we must not forget a fundamental theme as solidarity. The current direction is great accent on security on disadvantage of solidarity. Commission: has an important role to favour the process of integration. For us Europe would have to play a strongest role on themes such as peace”. In the same direction, our interviewee from Altragricoltura (552) states: “We are critical on the fact that integration is only a conquest of markets, there is no reflection upon what kind of Europe we want. The EU is the only opportunity that we have for thinking another model of economic development vis-à-vis the American one. We defend this possibility but we don't agree with the EU concrete choices. We live a contradiction”.

As for the institutional asset, NGOs tend to prefer the European Parliament, as the only elected organs, to the Commission and, especially, the Council. Altroconsumo (519) “has asked expressly that, in PAC decisions, the EU Parliament is more involved”. According to the Cospa (Spontaneous Committees of Agriculture producers) (502), “EU institutions are very influenced by groups of interest and multinationals. They have understood that EU institutions can be controlled. For instance, if the EU institutions had counted a little more, a more audacious EU constitution would have come out. The Council keeps still too much power. That is it is the only institution that it is now indeed authoritative and this is a pity, because it is the EU parliament that should have more authority”. Also the Caritas (514), although expressing “many doubts about the ability to find unitary politics between governments”, points at the “Good job done by the EU Commission and Parliament and the positive and strongly progressive impact of EU Commission”. For the CIR\_Onlus (560), “the efforts by the Commission are constrained by national governments; also the Council is constrained. Independently from the political majority, the Parliament promotes a larger European unity, but it has little decisional power!”. According to the AICRE (Italian Association of “Comuni” and Regions) (512), “the national state will not disappear and the EU Parliament must be

strengthened with a representative Chamber of States. The Commission has been very present and active but also confusing: it asked for more (power), but did not develop a coherent discourse”.

#### **v. Media Actors**

There is a large agreement among journalists that the European Union is at a turning point. As the Home Affairs Correspondent of *La Repubblica* (402) summarizes that “It is a phase of tiredness, institutional blockage because of the failure of a common policy of common defence (in Iraq)”.

Enlargement is a main preoccupation. The Co-director of *La Repubblica* (403) also stresses that “Today the way is difficult, dangerous, complicated because the enlargement sets enormous problems (of management, number of commissioners, etc.). If the EU has to be perfectly egalitarian, it would become non-manageable. It requires more flexible institution to manage a larger and larger Europe. It will be fatal to have, with the enlargement, a not perfectly integrated Europe and more speeds (2/3) or three circles (a more Europeanist; the UK; and the others), but it is unavoidable price. Personally I have always thought that the enlargement was dangerous; we brought it before more for duty than for necessity and unbalances will be inevitable”. The European Correspondent in Berlin for *La Nazione* (411) also talks of “a phase of contradiction: European integration is deepened (members are more and more connected) but enlargement risks frustrating this task. The institutions are for a more solid EU but it has been already difficult to make EU in 15, what will happen in two or three years when we'll be in 25?”.

Enlargement is considered as economically risky. The former Director (1991-95) and Editorialist of *La Nazione* (414) points at the economic difficulties of the enlargement, especially for a country that had enjoyed of a generous communitarian support: “From the ideal and political point of view enlargement is good, but it is also difficult. It will be a delicate moment when weaker countries enter EU, because they will attract helps and advantages to them, and it will also become risky for the larger countries. In fact, very competitive countries will enter. ... For the moment, it is good it is an union of states”.

Of the enlargement, also perceived is an institutional challenge. The Economy&Finance Correspondent (Agriculture Correspondent) of *La Repubblica* (404) points at the necessary, but difficult, institutional adjustment: “We are at a fundamental turning point (enlargement to 25), evidently important, also for the market, but a very critical passage because it needs that decisional processes are managed; decisions in 25 is an almost desperate enterprise if deep reforms of the decision-making mechanisms are not developed. The Convention and the new Constitution aim to this but if certain problems (majority vote) are not solved, it will be very difficult to proceed at the integration of the countries, because it will be impossible to make progress. I suppose some strengthened cooperation will be created in the EU at 2/3 speeds, with the largest countries pushing more, otherwise integration stops. It is necessary to eliminate veto rights, giving up national sovereignty on certain subjects”. According to the Director of *Il Mattino* (432), “If the New Constitution is not signed within the 2004 elections, we can forget a united Europe.

The signature of the new Constitution is fundamental to have rules respected by all, otherwise Europe remains incomplete. This way, hierarchies will change and equilibriums and other countries will enter the Eu". On this the EU Correspondent for *Il Corriere della Sera* (423) agrees: "If there is an European Constitution changing EU and making it more democratic and it takes a step forward, this will push the new members. If the process goes badly, everything else will go badly as well, because it means that neither in 15, neither in 25, the EU succeeds in managing things. If it succeeds, Eu can begin to work well on defence, coherent foreign politics."

Together with the enlargement, other problems are also perceived as emergent. As the EU Correspondent of *Il Corriere della Sera* summarises, "It is a difficult process because of the Iraq crisis, the problems with the stability pact, the protests of the small countries against enlargement. ... These are six important months, decisive for the European future (not for the Italian semester).

There is also the perception of a new struggle between integration and national powers. According to the Home Affair Correspondent of *La Nazione* (412), "we are going in the right direction but there is still the problem that it is a very slow process, of overlapping powers because of the national sovereignty that limits a real power of intervention of the Eu parliament. It's a process that has to go together with the evolution of the mentality of the people and the evolution of the principles of national sovereignty must give up more and more in the name of Europe, also united at a political and economical level." And this could reduce hope in the development of integration: according to the EU correspondent in Brussels for *La Repubblica* (401), "The process of European integration is becoming characterized by a pragmatic realism, I don't know how much it even becomes cynicism of the survival. It means Europe in 25 has to have engines succeeding in going faster otherwise the European integration becomes only for own national affairs. One needs to see how this balance between EU institutions and national institutions will be, how much governments will accept that, how much they will delegate. There is optimism of the will, pessimism of the reason, of the complexity". The Home Affair Correspondent of *La Repubblica* (402), however, stresses the need to "wait and see what will be of the European Chart. However, what has happened because of the war to Iraq is not healed yet".

About the choice between material and symbolic incentives, the Home Affair Correspondent of *Il Corriere della Sera* complain for the prevalence of the former: "European integration has evolved, we have had the Euro; before we had to change compare prices. But there are still nationalisms, and it is an economic EU that misses the formation of a European culture. A political European community is still distant from our perception". Also the Agriculture Correspondent of *Il Corriere della Sera* (422) is sceptical of the top-down process: "I agree with euro sceptic people: it is an integration always coming from above, it has always attracted particular categories making lever on corporativism. The EC was born on benefits that business could have (steel, agriculture). It is a formulation from above: some bankers have agreed to make Euro and they imposed it. In my opinion this is wrong, as it is wrong to write a European Constitution without having convinced people. It's still a very vertical formulation while a large battle from the bottom would have been necessary to communicate with the people. Decisions are instead catapulted from the top, and do not come from the bottom".

Also journalists disagree about the normative solution for Europe. Reflecting the position of his journal, the EU Correspondent in Brussels for La Repubblica is strongly in favour of deeper Europeanization: “I believe indeed that supranational institutions in a not excessively bureaucratic context represent the evolution of democracy in the next years because it allows to escape from the controls of local bosses, pressures, connivances; they widen the perspective of peace, war, polemics, reporting, therefore rights become something which cannot be subject to national affairs”.

Others are more sceptical. The former director of La Nazione strongly supports an intergovernmental vision of the process: “EU institutions are modest and their work is modest. The direction is marked and encouraged not so much by the EU institutions but by European governments. It is not the Commission that is leading the enlargement; it is the national governments, when they agree. The EU institutions are (fortunately!) a reflex of what 3/4/5 states decide to do”. Also the Home Affair Correspondent of Il Corriere della Sera share the impression of a larger-than-admitted role of the nation state—since “every country applies the European directives a little bit as it likes them”. The Foreign Affair Correspondent (EU Correspondent) of Il Mattino supports “EU with two speeds, with a group of countries acting as leaders (France and Germany)”. The Home Affair Correspondent of Il Mattino agrees that “Integration altogether is positive enough even if there are different speeds”. The Foreign Affair Correspondent (EU Correspondent) of Il Mattino states: “I am favourable to the integration but I would be more confederalist because I am pragmatic. The ideal would be the federalism but we are not the Usa, we didn’t have a war as federalists but we have to reach federalism slowly”.

Some express the opinion that, in this process, the supranational institutions would loose power towards the intergovernmental ones. The Economy&Finance Correspondent (Agriculture Correspondent) of La Repubblica sees “this tendency to strengthen the Council while the Commission is losing weight (technical executive); it develops in certain areas, but it is more and more a technical secretariat instead than an organ of political initiative. This will be clear in the next years”.

However, also the Parliament is considered to be on the winning side. According to the Vice-Director of Il Corriere della Sera, “Now the Parliament has its more authoritative area of influence and it will probably have a more defined role. This is desirable if there will be a real transfer of powers, otherwise it would be only an additional step if a multiplication of decisional levels”. And the Economy&Finance Correspondent (Agriculture Correspondent) of La Repubblica agrees that “The Parliament would be strengthened on the base of the new Constitution. According to me, this is right because it is the only organism legitimated by the citizens and it will provide more incisive importance as far as democratic legitimacy of the institutions is concerned”. The European Correspondent in Berlin for La Nazione proposes a federalist image, German style, with two parliamentary chambers “one regional which becomes national or super regional (ex. Baviera, North Italy). It is the best to reconcile local demands and politics of European nation”.

### *Bibliographical references*

- Bartolini, Stefano, 1998, *Exit Options, Boundary Building*, Florence, EUI Working Papers, SPS 98/1.
- Bull, Martin, 1996, *The Italian Christian democrats*, in Gaffney (ed.), *Political Parties and the European Union*, London, Routledge.
- Conti, Nicolò and Luca Verzichelli, forthcoming, *The European Dimension of Political Discourse in Italy: A Longitudinal Analysis of Party Preferences*, in Maurizio Cotta, Pierangelo Isernia and Luca Verzichelli (eds).
- Diez Medrano, Juan, 2003, *Framing Europe. Attitudes to European Integration in Germany, Spain and the United Kingdom*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Della Porta, D., 2003b, *The Europeanisation of Protest: A Typology and Some Empirical Evidence*, European University Institute, Working Papers.
- Falkner, Gerda, 2001, *Policy Network in a Multi-Level System: Convergence Towards Moderate Diversity*, in S. Hix and K.H. Goetz (eds.), *Europeanised Politics? European Integration and National Political System*, Frank Cass, pp. 94-120.
- Gabel, M.J. and Simon Hix, 2002, “Defining the EU Political Space”, in *Comparative Political Studies*, 35.
- Giuliani, Marco, 2000, “Europeanization and Italy: A Bottom-up Process?”, in *Southern European Society and Politics*, 5, pp. 47-72.
- Giuliani, Marco, 2000, *Europeanization and Italy: A Bottom-up Process?*, in *Southern European Society and Politics*, 5, pp. 47-72.
- Haas, Ernst B., 1958, *The Uniting of Europe*, Stanford, Stanford University Press.
- Hix, Simon and Klaus H. Goetz, 2001, *Introduction and National Political Systems*, in S. Hix and K.H. Goetz (eds.), *Europeanised Politics? European Integration and National Political System*, Frank Cass, pp. 1-26.
- Hooge, Liesbeth, Gary Marks and C. Wilson, 2002, “Does Left/Right Structure Party Positions on European Integration”, in *Comparative Political Studies*, 25.
- Mair, Peter, 2001, *The Limited Impact of Europe on National Party Systems*, in S. Hix and K.H. Goetz (eds.), *Europeanised Politics? European Integration and National Political System*, Frank Cass, pp. 27-51.
- Marks Gary and M. Steenbergen, 2002, “Understanding Political Contestation in the European Union”, in *Comparative Political Studies*, 32.
- Sbragia, Alberta, 2001, *Italy Pays for Europe. Political leaders, Political Choices and Institutional Adaptation*, in M. Green Cowles, James Caporaso and Thomas Risse (eds.), *Transforming Europe. Europeanization and Domestic Change*, Ithaca, Cornell University Press.
- Semetko, Holi, A. Claes de Vreese and Joachen Peter, 2001, *Europeanised Politics—Europeanised Media? European Integration and Political Communication*, in S. Hix and K.H. Goetz (eds.), *Europeanised Politics? European Integration and National Political System*, Frank Cass, pp. 121-141.
- Sitter, Nick, 2001, “The Politics of Opposition and European Integration in Scandinavia”, in *West European Politics*, 4.

Szczerbiak, A. and P. Taggart, 2002, *The Party Politics of Euroscepticism in the EU member and Candidate States*, ECPR joint Sessions, Turin, March

Walker, 1976, *Dal confronto al consenso. I partiti politici italiani e l'integrazione Europea*, Bologna, Il Mulino.

### **Appendix 1. List of interviews**

#### **a) EU integration**

##### **State Actor**

ID 572	Italian Foreign Affair Ministry: DG European Integration	Counsellor of Foreign Affair Ministry. DG Officer for European Integration	15.01.04
ID 570	Italian Parliament - IT representative at the Convention. Member of Foreign and EU Affair Parliament (Camera) Commission.	Temporary (Camera) Parliament Representative (Ulivo-DS) at place of Follini (UDC) at the Convention as Member of Foreign and EU Affair Parliament (Camera) Commission	19.01.04
ID 503	Italian Conference of Regions	Representative of the Conference of the Regions at the Convention	2.12.03
ID 525	Italian Ministry for Communitarian (EU) Politics	Head of Cabinet Vicar, President of Observatory for the Convention	9.03.04

##### **Party**

ID 569	Forza Italia	Responsible of European issues. Vice President of III Permanent Foreign Affairs Commission at Chamber of Deputies	22.01.04
ID 510	An	Member of Foreign Affair Parliament Commission at the Camera	10.12.03
ID 522	Ds	Responsible of European Integration and Integration politics. Member of III Permanent Foreign Affairs Commission (Chamber of Deputies)	23.11.03

**Interest Group**

ID 517	Cna	Responsible "European Integration" office	10.12.03
ID 508	Confcommercio	Responsible of European Integration Sector	27.10.03
ID 520	Confartigianato	Responsible of European Integration Sector	26.02.04
ID 567	Acli	Assistant of the Responsible for European Integration issues	27.01.04

**SMO-NGO-Association-Organization**

ID 512	AICRE (Italian Association of Communes and Regions)	General Secretary	14.01.04
ID 501	European Federalist Movement	President of Federalist European Movement	3.12.03
ID 505	Cobas	Cobas Responsible	24.11.03
ID 564	Noglobal/newglobal Movement (e.i.: Disobbedienti, Rete Lilliput): Rete Lilliput	Leader of Rete Lilliput	24.10.03

**b) Agriculture****State Actor**

ID 526	Italian Ministry for Communitarian (EU) Politics	Legislative Officer	9.03.04
ID 521	Italian Agriculture Ministry (DG for Rural Development politics)	DG Rural Development Political Office	8.03.04
ID 573	Italian Parliament (Chamber of Deputies)-XIII Permanent Agriculture Commission	Secretary of the Commission (Comunisti Italiani representative)	05.04.04
ID 574	Italian Agriculture Ministry	DG Food Politics-International Agreements Officer	31.03.04

**Party**

ID 555	Ds	Responsible of Agriculture. Spokesman of the Responsible of Agriculture	9.12.03
ID 515	Rifondazione Comunista	Agriculture Responsible	14.01.04

ID 568	Verdi	Responsible for Agriculture. Member of Agriculture Commission (Senato)	25.11.03
--------	-------	--	----------

### Interest Group

ID 556	FLAI-CGIL	Responsible for Agriculture subsidies and PAC	21.10.03
ID 554	Coldiretti	President	13.10.03
ID 553	CIA	President	13.10.03
ID 506	Confagricoltura	Assistant of the President	14.10.03
ID 551	Adiconsum	Responsible for Agriculture and PAC	21.03.03

### SMO-NGO-Association-Organization

ID 557	Legambiente	Responsible for Agriculture	25.09.03
ID 552	Altragricoltura	Member of the National Board of Directors. Responsible for Agriculture Subsidies	21.03.03
ID 558	Wwf	Responsible for Agriculture	26.09.03
ID 519	Altroconsumo	Responsible for Agriculture	26.02.04
ID 502	Cospa (Spontaneous Committees of Agriculture producers)	Member of national Direction.	20.11.03

### c) Immigration

#### State Actor

ID 571	Italian Foreign Affair Ministry: DG Immigration and Italian communities abroad	General Director of Ministry. DG Immigration Italian communities abroad Director	14.01.04
ID 566	Italian Labour and Social Affair Ministry (now Welfare Ministry)	General Director of DG Immigration	27.01.04
ID 565	Italian Foreign Affair Ministry: DG Immigration and Italian communities abroad	Counsellor of the General Director	27.01.04

#### Party

ID 513	Rifondazione Comunista	Responsible of Immigration Sector	14.01.04
ID 504	Lega	Responsible of Immigration Sector. Member of the I	24.11.03

		Permanent Institutional Affair Commission (Chamber of Deputies)	
ID 523	Ds	Responsible of Immigration Sector	25.11.03
ID 524	An	Responsible for Immigration Politics. Member of the III Permanent Foreign and EU Affair Commission (Chamber of Deputies)	8.03.04
ID 518	Ccd –Cdu	Group Head of the Parliament (Camera) Social Affair Commission	

### Interest Group

ID 509	Migrantes. Italian Episcopal Conference	Director of the National Pastoral Office for foreign migrants in Italy	10.12.03
ID 507	Red Cross (Crocerossa)	Responsible of Immigration Sector	26.09.03
ID 511	CNA	Responsible of Immigration Sector	10.12.03
ID 562	Cisl	Responsible of Immigration Sector	9.10.03
ID 561	Cgil	Responsible of Immigration Sector	13.10.03

### SMO-NGO-Associations-Organizations

ID 514	Caritas	Responsible of Immigration and editor of Annual Survey of Caritas	8.10.04
ID 569	Arci	Responsible of Immigration	14.10.03
ID 563	Comunità di Sant'Egidio	Administrator/Manager	21.10.03
ID 560	CIR_ Onlus	Administrator/Manager	27.10.03

### Journalists

ID 401	<i>La Repubblica</i>	EU Correspondent in Bruxelles	EU CORRESPON DENT	18.07.03
ID 402	<i>La Repubblica</i>	Home Affair Correspondent	HOME AFFAIRS CORRESPON	16.09.03

			DENT	
ID 403	<i>La Repubblica</i>	Co-director	EDITORS	16.09.03
ID 404	<i>La Repubblica</i>	Economy&Finance Correspondent (Agriculture Correspondent)	AGRICULTURE CORRESPONDENT	14.10.03
ID 411	<i>La Nazione</i>	Eu Correspondent in Berlin	EU CORRESPONDENT	6.08.03
ID 412	<i>La Nazione</i>	Home Affair Correspondent	HOME AFFAIRS CORRESPONDENT	18.07.03
ID 413	<i>La Nazione</i>	Agriculture Correspondent	AGRICULTURE CORRESPONDENT	13.05.03
ID 414	<i>La Nazione</i>	Ex Director (1991-95) - Editorialist	EDITORS	20.10.03
ID 421	<i>Il Corriere della Sera</i>	Home Affair Correspondent	HOME AFFAIRS CORRESPONDENT	16.09.03
ID 422	<i>Il Corriere della Sera</i>	Agriculture Correspondent	AGRICULTURE CORRESPONDENT	19.09.03
ID 423	<i>Il Corriere della Sera</i>	EU Correspondent	EU CORRESPONDENT	19.09.03
ID 424	<i>Il Corriere della Sera</i>	Vice-Director	EDITORS	24.09.03
ID 431	<i>Il Mattino</i>	Economy Correspondent (Agriculture Correspondent)	AGRICULTURE CORRESPONDENT	6.10.03
ID 432	<i>Il Mattino</i>	Director	EDITORS	6.10.03
ID 433	<i>Il Mattino</i>	Home Affair Correspondent	HOME AFFAIRS CORRESPONDENT	30.07.03
ID 434	<i>Il Mattino</i>	Foreign Affairs Correspondent (Eu)	EU CORRESPONDENT	29.07.03

		Correspondent)		
--	--	----------------	--	--