

FRENCH CITIZENS' INVOLVEMENT IN THE EU REPORT OF A QUALITATIVE STUDY IN FRANCE

OPTEM worked in cooperation with Inter View Partners

This Synthesis presents the results of a group discussion held in Lille on 10 December 2013 on the subject of citizens' involvement in the European Union. It is part of a wider citizenship project managed by Notre Europe – Jacques Delors Institute, with the support of national partners of the European Qualitative Network coordinated by OPTEM, on behalf of the European Commission.

Introduction

This report presents the results of a group discussion held in Lille on 10 December 2013 on the subject of citizens' involvement in the European Union.

It is the French section of a pan-European qualitative study involving 18 of the Member States.

In each country the study was carried out by the national partner of the European Qualitative Network coordinated by OPTEM. In France, OPTEM worked in cooperation with Inter View Partners, who was responsible for organizing the group discussion.

This study forms a part of a wider Citizenship Project managed by Notre Europe – Jacques Delors Institute on behalf of the European Commission.

BOX 1 ► Composition of the group of respondents

Gender

Women: 4

Men: 4

Age

20-34 years: 2

35-49 years: 3

50-60 years: 3

Social class

Lower-middle social class: 4 (professions of head of household: medical secretary, qualified manual worker, government department clerk, computer analyst)

Higher-middle class: 4 (professions of head of household: teacher, engineer, computer department manager, project manager)

Political opinion

The respondents were also recruited so that diverse political opinions were represented in the group.

1. Initial thoughts about the European Union

Several notions emerge from the initial stage of the discussion.

The relevance of building Europe: it is not seriously questioned by anyone in the group.

Firstly, the respondents are pragmatic and they understand the need for grouping the European countries in front of their competitors and opponents. *"Grouping countries together in order to be stronger vis-à-vis e.g. the Americans, to count in front of the other big countries. France alone would not have enough weight, whereas Europe can make myself be heard"*

"We know it is indispensable, we have no choice, in order to form a bloc against China, the USA, etc."

Moreover, at the same time several respondents claim that the union of European countries also involves shared ideals and values.

"The most positive point is that there are no more wars"

"For me, more than anything else Europe means a mixing of cultures..., each one brings his own stone"

Awareness of the influence of the European Union on the life of the citizens – even though its actual impacts – whether positive or negative – are not always clearly identified.

"I know it has an influence on food standards and many other things, construction for example... We do not keep thinking about it, but it does have an influence"

"European legislation is above French laws"

*"Influence of European legislation"
"And the single currency"*

The idea of something complex, heavy, and slow to move forward.

"A fantastic machine, but it needs to be oiled – and it lacks oil at the moment. It is needed, but it is complex indeed..."

"E 111 (The document required for social security health care insurance coverage when travelling in another EU country), is paradoxically very complicated... And I can't even figure out how complicated things are in areas where there are no European measures in force yet..."

"It's not easy considering the economic and cultural differences"

Here several persons - who think notably, but not only, of EU enlargement - express the feeling that the process was too fast - whereas, paradoxically, the same people criticize the slow pace of progress made in various areas.

"They are many possibilities to block the system with the requirement for unanimous decisions, it is bound to fail. We are making very, very slow progress owing to member countries having very different economies. Perhaps the EU was enlarged too quickly, as the expectations are so different from one country to another"

"We have cut corners..."

"It is not utopic, there are things that could be done faster..."

Decision processes and decision makers being seen as distant and hazy

"It is hard to figure it out... it is not clear who actually runs it"

"(Regarding the weight of the different countries, of which France, in the decision making process) How is it distributed?"

"One does not know, one has the impression of technocrats taking their decisions in isolation"

"Plenty of bureaucracy... They are things impossible to understand..."

"An impression, as external observers, of remote steering"

Consequently, little involvement on the part of the citizens

"It is very hazy, we do not have much information, it is far away from us and our everyday life"

"Enlarging, enlarging, enlarging, (but) the peoples have not been consulted..."

In 2005, the French voted against Europe in the referendum... perhaps it was a way of sanctioning the government, but the French were not the only ones, the Dutch did it too... (...).

A referendum may be a costly thing to set up, but perhaps they should listen to the peoples..."

"Decisions being taken on behalf of the Europeans, without asking them what they want..."

"We are indeed very seldom consulted on Europe"

Turning back to the many studies that OPTEM has carried out on European issues, we can clearly observe that this criticism of EU bureaucracy and this feeling of distance have grown over the years among the French.

At the same time - although the media actually devote much more space to these issues than in the past, the knowledge and understanding of the European Union remain extremely low.

One particular striking example can be quoted to illustrate this point: a secondary school teacher in the group, who is quite pro-European and is experienced in visiting EU institutions together with groups of pupils every year - yet who speaks of "the two Parliaments, one in Brussels (which turns out to be the Commission...) and the other in Strasbourg...": there is a lot of confusion, as can be seen in this case with regard to the institutional panorama.

Listening to other respondents, we can observe the existence of small bits and pieces of knowledge on the functioning of the EU and its institutions, yet not well assimilated and disconnected from each other.

"How are they actually organised when they are together? It is very nebulous... lobbyists are very powerful"

"Small countries are less well represented than larger countries..."

"Small countries can block (a decision)..."

2. Sources of information and knowledge on the EU

The discussion participants were invited to say **from what sources they get information or hear opinions on the European Union** - taking sources in a wide sense, including informal conversations with friends and acquaintances as well as more official sources.

(Not surprisingly) **they begin by mentioning the media** – television, and then radio before the printed press – **although at the same time they make negative or at least reserved comments about them.**

“There must be information somewhere, but not really in the (major) media...”

“Perhaps on more or less specialized channels”

“The media mainly tells you what goes wrong”

The Internet as a source or a means of access to information is also quoted – although mainly by respondents who are computer specialists particularly well versed in using the web.

“There must be quite a lot of information on the web. I heard about software patenting, following the American model... vaguely heard about it on the Internet

But, even if “there must a be lot that is available on the web”, “one must (make to effort to) go and search for it”.

Beside these two types of channels, **several sources are occasionally mentioned** by different respondents: visits to EU institutions and EU officials (the already mentioned case of a lady teacher, who also mentions student exchanges); travelling abroad, something more common for younger generations than for their elderlies; work situations in which one respondent was faced with European technical standards (which he criticizes for being less stringent than national norms as a result of “downwards harmonisation”); or occasional informal “pub style” discussions (in the latter case, mostly about the entry of new Member States such as Romania and the arrival of Rom groups of people – a highly controversial topic in France currently).

On the whole, few sources are mentioned, and the information one remembers to have found is very fragmented – each respondent was struck by one or a few particular aspects of the building of the European Union, EU policies and their implications.

No one in the group seems to have obtained from the sources used any overall view of what the EU is and does.

Another limitation of the information found was suggested by one respondent among the most europhile and the most eager to pay attention to EU related news:

“We know about it when a decision is taken, but we hear nothing before it is... so we just apply it, that’s all”

One final observation can be made on this subject: the respondents have in fact the feeling that information on the European Union “exists” or “must exist”.

“There must be available information...”

“There must be documents to be found...”

But this information is not easily reachable and it does not “get through” to them.

3. Questions regarding the future of the EU

The group was then invited to discuss the **future of the European Union** and to say what aspects they felt are important and should be better known and understood in that perspective, whether about the functioning of the EU or the directions it takes.

A few major topics gradually emerge (following a more confused initial stage of discussion):

The future of the Union in economic and social terms

The plague of unemployment is the first worry to be expressed, in relation notably with the opening up of borders within Europe and competition from enterprises and workers from other Member States.

The idea can be heard that the European legislation includes flaws which each country tries to take advantage of.

Although the respondents think of negative impacts for France of other countries’ competition in the first instance, it should be noted that they do not exclude that the reverse may be true (cf. for instance a discussion about both the good and bad arguments of French and Spanish fishermen who are heard to quarrel regularly).

Prospects for economic recovery are also discussed: in the short term, the issue of moving out of the crisis for France and the stricken countries more generally; in the longer term, the question of investments in scientific and technological research – in what areas will the EU invest?

Environmental policy

The question of the environment is mentioned, as it is known to be crucial for the future of the world as a whole.

Questions are asked about the policy of the Union (it is more or less clearly perceived as advanced compared with other countries in the world), but also about intra-European gaps between Member States who are advanced in this respect and others (new MS...) who are much less so.

"The European commitments on Kyoto,... The good and the bad pupils within Europe (...)"

"I would like to know if all the countries who belong to Europe today had ratified the environmental treaties"

Strengthening Europe's unity

Most of the members of the group visibly hope for a greater European unity, although this may appear paradoxical on the part of respondents who deplore either the intra-European competition or a downwards legislative harmonisation process, or else the presence in the Union of "bad pupils", i.e. countries who do not play the game next to the member States who do and behave as "good pupils".

In the above-mentioned domains, the respondents would visibly welcome **more common rules which all Member States accept and observe**.

"The European legislation is too loose"

"Perhaps there should be more controls"

More generally they express **the wish for more unity in all areas, and a genuine European political unity**.

"We should build a European political and military force"

"To start with, if our politicians had more courage, if the European Union spoke with one voice on key problems (...), it should not be so difficult to agree"

"We (the European countries) are always opposing each other! While we are building Europe? (Unfortunately) it will take decades for it to be a beautiful machine (...). This lack of unity is shocking"

The need is expressed **to be informed of any progress possibly made** in that direction, including "evolutions in the treaties", etc.

The institutional functioning of the European Union

We reported above about the **widespread ignorance** among the respondents in this respect.

Who decides? Who leads "Is it a petty European official or the leading politicians?")? How are decisions prepared, taken and applied? - These are among the questions asked by the respondents.

4. Current means of expression of citizens' views

When asked how citizens can give their opinion and have their voice heard "as regards future directions of the European Union", **the respondents mainly declare that they can vote**:

In referenda, when such consultations are organised.

In elections - several persons know that the next election for the European Parliament is due to take place in 2014.

However these means of expression are **far from being fully satisfactory**:

Referenda do allow everyone to express him/herself, but they have a major drawback (as reminded by several respondents) in that they only offer a "forced" binary choice.

As regards the European elections, they are marred by a low turnout at the voting stations, by the fact that the outcome is often a "punishment vote" against the government in place, unrelated to the EU issues that should be at stake, and the representatives who are elected are or soon become disconnected from the life of ordinary people anyhow.

"(In the European elections) one should talk about Europe, projects to be launched (so as to prevent the election from turning into a "punishment vote")"

"Concrete policies, straightforward speech, in order to get basic people interested... Our preoccupations are actually remote for the decision makers"

"Once the election is over, they do not really listen any longer..."

"Not because they do not want to, but they are no longer able to do it, they have lost contact"

Here **the group's discourse reflects the growing disillusion versus the politicians' world in France** - including references to elected representatives' absenteeism, the comfortable life which

their status allows them to live, or simply their being remote from the average citizen (this applies to national politicians no less than to eurodeputies).

As a result, some respondents are led to imagine (or dream of) **non-political representatives** (or at least not biased in their initiatives by their belonging to this or that party on the left or on the right), **or of independent organisations** to be set up to work on European issues.

"Creating an organisation that would work on the many subjects related to Europe, perhaps on a regional level..."

- Perhaps it could start from circles at a very basic level from which the thoughts expressed would gradually move up..."

Only one person in the group mentions another means of expression for citizens i.e. petitioning through the Internet (the already quoted young computer specialist).

"You also have web sites for petitions"

At that stage, the other participants do not add any comments - but this subject will be taken up later again.

5. Perceptions of new ways for citizens to get their voice heard

When asked to imagine **new ways by which citizens could make themselves heard**, the respondents come up with **two main ideas**:

Use of electronic means of communication, i.e. the Internet, social networks, etc.

Those means would be used not only to get information, but also to voice opinions.

"A dedicated service to which questions, complaints, requests could be addressed, and getting a reply"

This service is spontaneously seen as based primarily on the Internet, but other means could be implemented in addition for "older people who do not have the Internet", according to one participant.

Need for proximity in provision of information and debate.

The non-electronic component of the above-described service could be installed in town halls or in other nearby public places.

Some respondents refer to "local district councils" to meet a few times per year in each area of the city, with elected representatives attending - proximity is believed to help fostering interest, just like in local municipal meetings or in the "neighbours' days".

"Motivating those who are not motivated and who do not vote"

In the same line of thought, one respondent thinks of setting up "citizens consultations" following the model of public enquiries ("enquêtes d'utilité publique") before launching urban projects - they would be useful to produce "a first draft" of citizens' demands and propositions.

6. Assessment of several propositions for improving citizens' involvement

Eight propositions were presented to the group.

A. An information service on the functioning of the EU and EU policies, comprising an information office open for the public in every large city, a web site, and a service quickly answering any questions asked by telephone, mail or email.

Reactions to this proposition - which has some similarities with an idea emerging spontaneously in the preceding discussion theme - **are moderately favourable.**

- Reservations are voiced by several respondents:
- It is solely an information site; citizens also wish to be able to express requests or complaints.
- It is likely to be of interest only for "those who are already interested".
- (Remark made by a respondent with a scientific background who is much used to information search on the Internet) such information can already be found on the Net "if you are curious".
- Such a system is supposed to be very costly (incidentally, the preceding respondent had questioned the need for non electronic means of access to the information.

It should be noted that the description of the service as presented in this proposition corresponds closely to the Europe Direct services which have existed for many years already - but obviously none of the respondents had ever heard of them.

B. Debates to be organised in major media between average citizens and experts of EU issues on the directions taken by the EU.

This proposition does not really appear as new. It reminds the respondents of television programmes that were broadcasted in a more or less distant past, from "L'heure de vérité" to debates of the same type at the time of the last presidential election: programmes in which they recognize that they "learnt something".

The proposition is not rejected: it arouses interest because of its interactivity, the participation of rank and file citizens (provided "professional categories are well selected" to ensure a diversity of situations), together with experts deemed to be objective and able to make the debate intelligible to laymen.

C. Opinion polls on the EU organised regularly in the whole of Europe, allowing citizens to know both what their fellow countrymen and what the citizens of the other countries think.

Reactions to the third proposition are extremely positive (the only reservations expressed being the traditional queries about sample representation - but they are few).

- Through the sample representing them, citizens can state what their expectations are.
- Such surveys being organised regularly contributes to their interest.

"A permanent poll... why not?" (n'existe pas dans le texte français)

- Being able to make comparisons with other Europeans from the results in the different EU countries is a crucial element giving added value to such surveys.

"For better (mutual) understanding"

The question is asked, however, how the results will be disseminated: they should be easily accessible, "you must not need to go and search for them".

The respondents manifestly ignore that surveys of this nature (Eurobarometer) have been organised by the European Commission for several decades (It remains to be seen whether the questions asked would be regarded as interesting by the citizens).

D. The possibility, given several times per year, to meet with your Members of the European Parliament or other EU politicians in the vicinity of where you live.

Relative interest is expressed when this proposition is presented, although it is not very new according to some respondents (they are in fact thinking of meetings in the constituency of elected representatives who were wearing "several hats", not necessarily their MEP's hat on those occasions). Certain conditions should be met, however:

- Those meetings should really deal with Europe.
- They should have the systematic character of "reporting sessions" by the politicians concerned, to be held at defined times, announced in advance.

"A little like the yearly evaluation meeting between an employee and his/her superior in business firms"

- Proximity, as stated above (and, it seems from the reactions of those who express themselves on this subject, very close proximity), is a basic requirement. Publicity is also needed to make people aware of these events.

Yet, certain doubts are voiced:

"It already exists, more or less, and we do not attend"

E. Consultations through the Internet organised by the European Commission whenever major decisions have to be taken in the EU, open to all citizens.

Reactions to this idea are very positive, as it responds in principle to the need, already clearly expressed, to be listened to by those in charge - who are currently perceived as remote and disconnected from their fellow citizens' problems.

"It should make our views better taken into consideration"

Some conditions have yet to be met to foster interest:

- The need to publicize the existence of these consultations by local communication ("for example, through the municipality").
- An obligation to provide feedback on what was done with the results of the consultation.

F. Similar consultations, organised by our national government.

This proposition differed from the preceding one only in the identity of its initiator: the national government instead of the European Commission.

The group unanimously prefers the consultation to be organised by the Commission, as it is deemed more neutral and more objective.

"Otherwise, if each government made its own cooking with it..."

Besides, the wish comes up again of information on EU challenges that should not have "political labels".

G. An interactive service using the Internet and social networks, to collect on a permanent basis citizens' views, wishes or criticisms on directions taken by the EU.

Interest is expressed much in the same way as for Proposition E. Reservations and questions concern the "how" organise a permanent multi-purpose consultation of this nature (although one respondent mentions the existence of similar systems on "mayors' Facebook pages").

"It looks difficult to manage"

"It would too easily give people a say and on so many subjects..." (the problem being the great mass of information and the need for it to be structured)

"But there would be moderators"

"Software"

"Will it be anonymous or not?"

(Most are not in favour of it, as that might make the process drift away from what was intended)

H. Information campaigns to be developed much more actively than in past years, in order to encourage citizens to involve themselves in the debates that are to take place and to take part in the coming election of Members of the European Parliament next Spring.

The proposition of information campaigns on the occasion of the European Parliament election brings about **a positive response in principle**, to increase citizens' awareness and encourage them to vote.

The campaigns should be "easily digestible", "accessible", "should not require to have had 6 years in university", "should not be like for the referendum where you had to read 15 pages", etc.

APPENDIX - DISCUSSION GUIDE

Étude qualitative sur l'implication citoyenne dans l'Union européenne

Introduction

Demander à chaque participant de se présenter en quelques mots, en disant qui il (elle) est et ce qu'il (elle) fait, etc.

Thème 1

Nous sommes réunis aujourd'hui pour parler de l'Union européenne. Qu'est-ce qui vous vient à l'esprit tout d'abord à propos de l'Union européenne ?

- Réactions spontanées
- Explorer :
- Nature des sujets évoqués à propos de l'UE
- Aspects positifs et aspects négatifs liés à l'UE
- Degré d'intérêt a priori et d'implication des participants dans les questions relatives à l'UE

Thème 2

Ce que vous savez et ce que vous pensez de l'Union européenne, d'où cela vient-il ? De quelles sources recevez-vous des informations ou des opinions sur l'Union européenne - en prenant le terme « sources » au sens le plus large, allant des sources d'information officielles aux conversations informelles qu'on peut avoir avec des amis ou d'autres personnes... ?

- Réactions spontanées
- Explorer :
- Degré de diversité des sources mentionnées
- Nature des apports (d'information) de chacune
- Intérêt/crédibilité de chacune

Thème 3

Nous allons parler plus particulièrement de l'avenir de l'Union européenne, et des questions que vous pouvez vous poser à ce sujet. Il y a sans doute des choses qu'il serait important pour vous de mieux connaître et de mieux comprendre sur le fonctionnement et sur les orientations de l'Union européenne, mais pour lesquelles les sources dont vous avez parlé tout à l'heure ne vous donnent pas tout ce que vous voudriez. Sur quoi notamment souhaiteriez-vous en savoir plus ?

- Réactions spontanées
- Explorer :

- Impressions générales de bonne ou de mauvaise connaissance/compréhension de ces questions
- Perception des enjeux majeurs pour l'UE dans les années à venir
- Expressions de besoins de meilleure connaissance et compréhension - sur quels sujets plus précisément ? En quoi les informations dont on peut disposer actuellement sur ces sujets sont-elles insatisfaisantes ?

Thème 4

En tant que citoyen, vous devez pouvoir donner votre avis et faire entendre votre voix sur les orientations futures de l'Union européenne - que ce soit pour approuver ou pour contester telle ou telle orientation, ou pour toute autre raison. Comment pouvez-vous le faire aujourd'hui ?

- Réactions spontanées
- Explorer :
- Facilité/difficulté perçue à s'exprimer et à faire entendre sa voix sur les questions relatives à l'UE - par quels moyens ?
- Causes perçues de difficulté
- Sujets sur lesquels on voudrait plus précisément pouvoir donner son avis et être entendu en tant que citoyen ; attentes à cet égard.

Thème 5

On peut penser à différents moyens pour les citoyens européens comme nous de faire entendre leur voix. Nous allons, si vous le voulez bien, essayer de penser à toutes sortes de moyens possibles, en nous laissant aller à notre imagination, et sans nous arrêter pour le moment à la question de savoir comment le réaliser en pratique. Que pourrait-on imaginer ?

- Réactions spontanées
- Stimuler la créativité du groupe en encourageant à « rebondir » d'une idée à une autre

Thème 6

Je vais maintenant vous soumettre différentes idées qui ont été émises, de moyens par lesquels les citoyens pourraient mieux faire entendre leur voix sur les questions concernant l'Union européenne. Vous me direz ce que vous pensez de chacune.

- Faire réagir successivement à chaque proposition, en faisant expliciter le degré et les raisons d'intérêt

A. Un service d'information sur le fonctionnement et les politiques de l'Union européenne, comportant un bureau d'information ouvert au public dans chaque grande ville, un site Internet, et un service

de réponse rapide aux questions posées par téléphone, lettre ou courriel.

- B.** Des débats dans les grands medias sur les orientations de l'Union européenne, entre des citoyens moyens et des spécialistes de ces questions.
- C.** L'organisation régulière, dans toute l'Europe, d'enquêtes par sondage sur l'Union européenne, permettant de savoir ce que pensent nos concitoyens aussi bien que les citoyens des autres pays.
- D.** La possibilité de rencontrer à proximité de chez vous, plusieurs fois dans l'année, vos députés au Parlement européen et d'autres responsables politiques européens.
- E.** L'organisation par la Commission européenne d'une consultation par Internet ouverte à tous les citoyens à chaque fois qu'une décision importante doit être prise dans l'UE.
- F.** L'organisation de consultations similaires par notre gouvernement national.
- G.** Un service interactif, utilisant Internet et les réseaux sociaux, pour recueillir en permanence les avis, les souhaits ou les critiques des citoyens sur les orientations de l'Union européenne.
- H.** Des campagnes d'information beaucoup plus actives que par le passé pour inciter les citoyens à s'intéresser aux débats qui auront lieu et à participer à la prochaine élection des députés au Parlement européen du printemps prochain.

Merci à nouveau de votre participation.

Si d'autres idées vous viennent à la suite de notre réunion, n'hésitez pas à nous en faire part.

(Communiquer aux participants une adresse électronique qu'ils pourront utiliser pour ce faire)

WHAT DO CITIZENS THINK THE FUTURE CHALLENGES OF THE EU ARE?

Virginie Timmerman, *Synthesis*, Notre Europe – Jacques Delors Institute, December 2014

HOW WOULD CITIZENS LIKE TO COMMUNICATE WITH THE EUROPEAN UNION?

Virginie Timmerman and Daniel Debomy, *Synthesis*, Notre Europe – Jacques Delors Institute, December 2014

HOW DOES THE EUROPEAN UNION COMMUNICATE WITH CITIZENS?

Virginie Timmerman and Daniel Debomy, *Synthesis*, Notre Europe – Jacques Delors Institute, November 2014

HOW DO CITIZENS SEE THE EUROPEAN UNION?

Virginie Timmerman, *Synthesis*, Notre Europe – Jacques Delors Institute, November 2014

▶ HOW TO COMMUNICATE WITH THE EU? THE OPINION OF EUROPEAN CITIZENS

Video, Notre Europe – Jacques Delors Institute, November 2014

CITIZENS FACING "BRUSSELS' EUROPE"

Virginie Timmerman, *Synthesis*, Notre Europe – Jacques Delors Institute, August 2014

EUROPEAN CITIZENS IN BRUSSELS: WHAT MESSAGES?

Virginie Timmerman, *Synthesis*, Notre Europe – Jacques Delors Institute, August 2014

THE INVOLVEMENT OF EU CITIZENS IN THE EUROPEAN PROJECT

Daniel Debomy, *Synthesis*, Notre Europe – Jacques Delors Institute, July 2014

▶ WHAT THE FRENCH TOLD US ABOUT GLOBALISATION

Video, Notre Europe – Jacques Delors Institute, May 2014

▶ WHAT THE FRENCH TOLD US ABOUT EURO

Video, Notre Europe – Jacques Delors Institute, May 2014

▶ WHAT THE FRENCH TOLD US ABOUT THE EUROPEAN DEMOCRACY

Video, Notre Europe – Jacques Delors Institute, May 2014

▶ WHAT THE FRENCH TOLD US ABOUT THE EMPLOYEMENT IN THE EU

Video, Notre Europe – Jacques Delors Institute, May 2014

EU NO, EURO YES? EUROPEAN PUBLIC OPINIONS FACING THE CRISIS (2007-2012)

Daniel Debomy, *Policy Paper No. 90*, Notre Europe – Jacques Delors Institute, March 2013

DO THE EUROPEANS STILL BELIEVE IN THE EU?

Daniel Debomy, *Studies & Reports No. 91*, Notre Europe – Jacques Delors Institute, June 2012

MIGRANTS – EUROPEAN STORIES

Frédéric Praud, Florence Brêthes, Hamed Borsali and Kiel, *Comics*, Paroles d'hommes et de femmes / Notre Europe, May 2012

THE CITIZENS OF EUROPE AND THE EUROPEAN UNION IN THE CURRENT CRISIS

Daniel Debomy, *Policy Paper No. 47*, Notre Europe – Jacques Delors Institute / Fondation Jean Jaurès, November 2011

Managing Editor: Yves Bertoncini • The document may be reproduced in part or in full on the dual condition that its meaning is not distorted and that the source is mentioned • The views expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect those of the publisher • Notre Europe – Jacques Delors Institute cannot be held responsible for the use which any third party may make of the document • Translation from French: Eurologos • © Notre Europe – Jacques Delors Institute

