

GREEK CITIZENS' INVOLVEMENT IN THE EU

REPORT OF A QUALITATIVE STUDY IN GREECE

Focus Bari

This Synthesis presents the results of a group discussion held in Greece on 11 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 Greece on 11 December 2013 on the subject of citizens' involvement in the European Union.

It is the Greek 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 Greece by focus Bari.

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	Age
Women: 4	20-34 years: 3
Men: 5	35-49 years: 3
	50-60 years: 3

Social class

Lower-middle social class: 4 (professions of head of household: 1 manual worker, 3 non managerial office employees)

Higher-middle class: 5 (professions of head of household: 2 middle management employees in the private sector, 1 middle management employee in the public sector, 1 member of a liberal profession, 1 small business owner)

Political opinion

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

The **Greek economic crisis** that followed European and global recession has radically affected perceptions and stances of Greek people towards the EU.

It is recognized that, due to the crisis in Greece and other southern-European countries, all nations tend to adopt a **more nationalistic attitude**, letting the "ideal" of a unified Europe aside

Moreover, it is evidenced that the EU as an institution **cannot tackle or proactively avoid crisis situations** that strongly affect weaker countries, such as: unemployment, salary cut-downs, deterioration of the quality of living, etc.

As a result, respondents feel that the EU **has somehow failed** to respond to its role as a "protection net" for its member-states

On a spontaneous level, the following **concerns on the nature and the mechanisms of the EU** are mentioned:

- A union based on **inequalities**, intensified due to economic crisis
"Decisions are directed by the strongest member states, we, as the weak ones, have to suffer them, whether we like it or not"
"Heterogeneity is becoming stronger lately... states are after their own interests, not caring for the common good"
- **Evident economic gap** – the euro has affected national economies of weaker member states in a negative way and on multiple levels
"At first, a common currency seemed a positive thing... now we are not sure at all"
"Due to the euro, Greece is in a crisis right now and prices continue to rise"

1. Initial thoughts about the European union

Strong **disillusionment** and **skepticism** is expressed in relation to the EU today

"How can we speak of a union, when salaries in northern Europe are 4 times up the Greek ones?"

- **A strong feeling of insecurity** stemming from differences between national interests
"Our lives and our future depend on the decisions taken by some member states, not the EU as a whole"
"Each country sets different priorities: national security, immigration and border protection are essential for us, while they mean nothing for countries like Belgium"
- A rather **pessimistic** and **passive attitude** is overall expressed, especially by mid- and older-aged respondents (40+ y.o.)
"The European union is like a dream which is gradually becoming a nightmare"
"There is no common vision for a united Europe anymore"

On the other hand, positive aspects of the EU are also recognized, even though, again due to the economic crisis, the benefits are rather "theoretical" and **interesting only when they touch upon individual interests**

- **Freedom to travel, study and work** in any member state: especially significant for younger-aged respondents (20-34 y.o.)
"The Erasmus program... you can spend some studying time abroad"
"No need for visa or even a passport"
"More working opportunities in other European countries"
- **Financial support** and **trading/business opportunities** for Greece through support programmes: especially significant for higher-middle class respondents (esp. Entrepreneurs)
"Market freedom - you can do business internationally"
"Subsidies to support private businesses and large-scale projects"
"Without EU funding, Greece would not have the infrastructure it has today"

Finally, a **legislative and political effort to establish a common set of rules** is recognized as a positive step by some higher-middle class respondents

- Protection of human and children's rights and the European court are characteristic examples of "positive" action by the EU

In sum, the EU is viewed as a financial union that mainly caters for the interests of its strongest member states, while offering, at the same time, some

opportunities to **transcend national frontiers** and access an international "audience" (either market or culture)

"Even the fact that EU headquarters are set in The Hague, Brussels and Strasbourg carries a symbolism... Madrid, Athens, Sofia are mere followers, not active contributors"

While, it is also recognized that **on a national level, opportunities offered were not well-exploited**, thus creating a **feeling of disappointment** both for the EU and the national institutions

"We are also to blame ourselves... for years we thought of the EU as a milking cow only"

2. Sources of information and knowledge on the EU

To begin with, low interest in pro-actively learning about the EU, if not somehow **linked to national or personal issues and interests** is expressed

- All respondents recognize that, unless information is "thrown upon" them, or unless they have specific queries, they **do not tend to look for relevant information**
"I frequently visit the site of the European parliament, due to work... i need to be up to date on new programs and funding but, other than that, i am not interested much"
"We have other things in our mind... we strive to survive nowadays, getting informed on the EU is a luxury"

Main reasons for this "passive" attitude:

- The European union is a **distant, chaotic and bureaucratic institution** and, due to the crisis and the predominance of stronger member states over the weaker ones (such as Greece), there is no clear reason to get actively involved (unless looking for specific information)
- **Too many EU institutions, bodies**, etc., each offering **fragmented pieces of information**
"You do not know where to start from"
- **Too many "filters"** in the final information "output" so far: EU interests, national/member state interests, media interests - thus, making overall updating non-trustworthy overall
- An overall feeling that **individual saying is very weak** - up to non-existent
- **Low understanding of EU's broader/political role** or individual functions, since its main perceived nature is of financial/funding nature

Thus, overall knowledge on the EU and what it stands for is based on:

- Accumulated pieces of information/knowledge **through the years** (for older-age respondents)
- **Own experiences** through travelling in other European countries or doing business with European organizations (for younger-age and higher-middle class respondents)
- **Mass media references**, mainly TV political debates among local politicians or reports on EU decisions that affect the country

Spontaneously, the main source identified as most adequate and appealing is the **internet** (ESP. For higher-middle class), directly followed by **TV** (ESP. By lower-middle class)

- The **internet** (esp. Official sites of EU institutions) is perceived as the most adequate and reliable source: **trans-national reach and freedom of access** (whoever, whenever, wherever), fit perceptions on the EU. However, a sense of "formality" and bureaucracy is evidenced in EU official sites, which does not allow for stronger involvement; in other words, EU informative sources reflect its distant, non-personalized character and attitude, serving only as a "database" of general information and specific programs
- **TV**, on the other hand, is overall **not well appreciated** nowadays, especially since, in Greece, public-interest TV channels (the traditional "carriers" of EU messages) are at the moment under re-organization and do not broadcast for a few months; privately-owned TV channels, on the other hand, are considered neither credible, nor willing to objectively inform the public on EU-related issues

"The only reason a privately owned TV channel is willing to offer further information on the EU is only if the owner has some tangible benefits out of it"

In sum, in a country and society that strongly feels that the EU is a distant, not particularly intriguing institution, **information needs to avoid as many "filters" as possible**

- **Direct, personalized, "interesting" information** which is **easily accessible** is the main objective

3. Questions regarding the future of the EU

As already stated, respondents recognize that **the EU "ideal" is jeopardized nowadays by the augment of national interests and trans-national inequalities**

- A **shift towards common European values** is desired by Greeks, to counter-balance current perceptions and shortcomings (as stated in chapter 1)

"We have to re-invent what unites us; all we hear about is on what sets us apart"

- Notions like **"democracy"**, **"collaboration"**, **"solidarity"**, **"justice"** were often mentioned during the discussion, mainly as areas in which the EU-related information should focus

"Once, we believed that a European identity is possible... now i strongly feel that we, as Europeans, have not worked hard enough to reach this goal"

- However, respondents recognize that **achievement of "balance" is difficult**, since the EU ideal should at no point overshadow national strategies, beliefs and mentalities

"Why should Europe direct me on what is right or wrong... we have our own national representatives"

- On top, especially higher-middle class respondents recognize that **own passivity and focus on individual interests** (as opposed to common good) has contributed to the current situation

"We also need a mentality change... each nation and each culture could have contributed more creatively, but we did not. Now, i am afraid it could be too late for all"

Given the situation today, as **extreme focus on economic relations and interests** among EU member states has proved inadequate to represent what EU stands for, **two main tendencies** on the future of EU emerge:

- The **disappointed** ones (mainly older age and lower-middle class respondents) can only be motivated through **financial incentives/support** (to the country and the Greek people) so as for EU to re-establish its credibility in their eyes
"When we were in need, they did not protect us; they just made it harder for us... what kind of union is this?"
- The **"conscious"** ones (mainly younger ages and higher-middle class respondents) feel that a **political consensus/union** is essential, on top of the economic one, even though they recognize how difficult this could be

"The natural evolution should be a common constitution and a higher power to the European parliament instead of the commission. If we want a unified Europe, we need to have at least a common set of rules"

In any case, for both tendencies, it seems that **the need for intervention on how the EU is structured nowadays** is needed – an "intervention" similar to the one realized when member states embraced the common currency

- To this respect, in terms of what citizens need to "learn" about, the most crucial issue is **where EU is heading**, so as to clear the blurred picture of today: a mid- or long-term plan, related to a new (or renewed) EU vision
- In other words, they need to **know more on common political decisions/consensus** so as to experience the desired sense of unity
"The problem is that all information we get is about the differences between member states. There is no common political directive, something that says to the world: 'this is what Europe as a whole believes on this issue'"

4. Current means of expression of citizens' views

Since the EU is regarded as an overall distant and complex institution, for Greek respondents it seems almost **"natural"** and **acceptable** that their voice cannot be heard

- Up to now, it is perceived that the **EU follows a "top-to-bottom" approach** in relation to information released for the public: **citizens do not need to bother**, since all decisions are on a high political/negotiation level
- Moreover, since the EU is perceived to have a **"consultative"** rather than an "authoritative" role in comparison to national governments, it is highly understood that **decisions and actions are first filtered on a national level** and, then, final decisions are publicized
Given that Greeks are in a state of **parallel disillusionment about national politicians**, as well, these filters are passively taken for granted, however not necessarily accepted **nor positively evaluated**
- Finally, since it is perceived that **national interests transcend "common" ones**, the media and political representatives **tend to stress differences rather than consensus**

"For instance, on the issues of Syria and Serbia Greece had a stand-alone approach and this was promoted through national media? I never came to listen to actual EU arguments, only their criticism"

On the other hand, the idea of citizens having direct access to the EU so as to make their voice heard is **positively received**, since:

- It constitutes a **form of "intervention"** in EU operations as perceived today (in line with what Greek respondents need): a **grass-roots** rather "top-down" approach is quite appreciated, especially since the EU is perceived to having become stagnant
- It is a step towards a **"Europe of people"** rather than today's "Europe of economies and interests": it creates **expectations that the EU is in a transformational process** towards reaching out to its citizens
- It could **motivate citizens out of their passivity** and make them contribute more creatively; of course, as recognized by respondents themselves, this will be a **gradual, slow process** and citizens will only be convinced if they experience in practice that their voice is heard

However, a **more "grass-roots" approach is not necessarily activating for all**, since some citizens (especially those more disappointed) tend to "enjoy" their passivity

"I am not optimistic at all. I do not think i can affect top-level decisions by expressing my opinion"

Main issues mentioned as worth knowing more about (and contributing, as well) are **EU scope and future actions** on:

- Taxation: mainly due to current discussions on the potential of a common taxation system among EU members
- The future of EU itself: how EU officials envision it and where this could lead Europe as a whole and individual communities
- Protection of human rights and minority rights
- Protection of the quality of life for its people: especially important for Greece, at a time of crisis
- External relations: EU theses on its relations with china, the USA, etc.
- Border protection: how EU safeguards that more "vulnerable" member states (Italy, Greece) are not fighting against illegal immigration on their own

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

As already stated, “**generally informative**” **campaigns** or **messages** are **not considered relevant** in this moment.

- It is interesting to notice that, during this “brainstorming” session, **traditional campaigning vehicles** (TV ads, leaflets, etc.) Were not mentioned at all
- Respondents tended to focus on ways that **promote the exchange of opinions and ideas** and have a more **interactive** nature

Most prominent ideas that emerged during discussion:

- A **pan-European TV channel**, expressing what European mentality and “future” is about
“Such an institution like the EU should have its own means to inform and interact... they should have their own TV channel”
- A **representative citizen’s forum**, to collect ideas and evaluate policies
“Like a jury, people from different countries, selected to have different backgrounds that offer their opinion and input on decisions to be taken”
- A **support group per commissioner, comprised by citizens**, to collect opinions, form a “grass-roots” body and consult in significant issues
“Since i cannot reach the commissioner directly, nor the members of the European parliament, such a group can collect my petitions or even ideas and communicate them to the respective bodies... in such a way, they would be obliged to listen to what we have to say; now they are not”
- An **online voting system**, asking for opinions and stances
“In many cases, internet voting have made a difference... this could also happen here”
- A **friendlier, more interactive** internet site (compared to official sites of EU bodies) **of informative character** that offers updates on everything that is new
“Like news portal, dedicated to the updating on main EU subjects. One can choose which sections interest him and news can come through e-mail or Facebook”

On top of these propositions, the idea of **pan-European referenda** on “socially significant” issues was also discussed

- Referenda as a form of direct democracy are of **ambivalent value**, however it seems that in some cases, they can **enhance the European identity** and ensure a **sense of “belonging”**
- Subjects of interest could initially be mainly **“soft” issues** (not entailing economic decisions or external politics) in which a consensus is necessary
“A referendum on whether Greece should abandon the Eurozone, for example, could be really catastrophic. A referendum on whether homosexual couples should have the same rights as heterosexual ones, however, could make sense”

6. Assessment of several propositions for improving citizens’ involvement

As stated above, given the current situation in Greece and **overall disillusionment** by the EU, **“passive” informative campaigns** are **not well-appreciated**

Greek respondents ask for **more direct ways** to access the EU and have their voice heard, so as to safeguard that intermediate “filters” (ESP. By national authorities) are avoided

Thus, most positively evaluated propositions include: **a, e, g** which constitute **“direct democracy”** examples, and somehow **ameliorate the distant and impersonal character of the EU**

Negatively evaluated propositions are: **b, d, f** which **entail intermediate “filters”** (mass media organizations, political parties, etc.) And thus are perceived as a tool to **promote individual interests**

On top of these propositions, the establishment of **referenda** (as described in the previous chapter) and a **direct medium for ongoing provision of information** (e.g. The TV channel) are well-appreciated

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.

Quite positively evaluated, as a one-stop-shop for information provision by specialized personnel. It has to be noted that **none of the respondents linked it to the “Europe direct” service**

- Mainly perceived useful for the discovery of **new “opportunities”**: EU funding programs, work positions, etc. However, **not considered adequate** to inform citizens on **broader political or economic decisions** and directives
- Its main **positive** aspects: **personalized** provision of information, **multiple channels** to address different citizens, **decentralization** (existence in each major city), creation of **new jobs**

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

Respondents react rather negatively, since the proposition has to follow national/local “rules” of the media market and, thus, there is no fruitful ground for its elaboration

- Public interest TV channels are practically **non-existent** in Greece and generally attract **limited viewership**
- Privately owned TV channels are considered **part of the “status quo”**, promoting individual economic or political interests and, thus, **not objective**

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.

A rather **ambivalent** proposition; degree of acceptance highly depends on **respondents’ profile** (the younger ones being more accepting, overall) and **on the main issues** that such a poll promotes/communicates; from some of the higher-upper class respondents similarities to the euro-barometer were mentioned

- On the positive side: a **chance to express own opinion** and, at the same time, **compare opinions** with other European citizens; however, to be effective, polls should be handled as a chance to start a discussion on its results through various means

“For such an initiative to be productive, it needs strong advertising so that people are interested and expect the results in anxiety. And it also needs to be analyzed on TV or other media”

- On the negative side: **not “exciting”** or **“intrusive”** enough; participation in a poll is a rather **indirect way** to express own opinion while, at the same time, individuality is lost in the analysis

“Numbers are not enough to express a mentality. I want the freedom to express myself as an individual”

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.

A rather **non-interesting** proposition, which resembles a **pre-election campaign** more, rather than a structured tool for exchange of opinions and ideas

- Overall, the European parliament is **not considered adequate** as a country’s EU representatives are believed to represent national interests instead of the EU positions; thus, a discussion on a national level will eventually **confirm local theses**, rather than expand the horizons through a trans-national perspective

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

One of the **most interesting** and **appealing** propositions, of **intrusive** and **interactive** character

- The internet is overall perceived as a **powerful tool** to affect decision-making and make a difference, because of its “open” character and the possibility to exchange views on the subject
- The proposition has a **dual value**: both as a means to **express own opinion** and as a tool to **learn what other citizens believe** on the issue
- The only concern (raised mainly by women and older ages) is **whether one will be actively motivated to participate**; to this respect, a **communication campaign** is deemed necessary, so as for citizens to be intrigued

“We Greeks do not have a participating culture, overall. Only if the subject is interesting and you come across it, through Facebook, from example, will you be urged to contribute”

“It depends on the subject and on how it is presented on the site; if all Europeans citizens participate, it will eventually become chaotic, it needs to be well-structured”

F. Similar consultations, organised by our national government.

The addition of a **national filter** is **negatively evaluated**

“It will be filtered based on national interests, thus it beats its purpose”

"When localized, there is no value in it any more... the point is to exchange views with other people abroad, not with other Greeks - i already know what Greeks think"

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.

The most **free, open** and **direct** proposition of all, well-appreciated by all respondents

- On the positive side: **easy, simple, effective** contribution, based on tools that citizens use every day; **freedom of expression** is ensured
- On the negative side: the **danger of such tool becoming chaotic** is stressed by the respondents; they stress out the importance of a **flexible but well-defined structure** based on thematic categories and the need to somehow **bridge linguistic differences**

"How will i understand what Germans say? Automatic translations are not good enough and often lead to misunderstandings. And, on top, how will i be able to focus on the subject that really interests me?"

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 most **"expected"** means of communication: **indispensable** so as to inform on forthcoming actions and boost interest in the forthcoming elections

- Mass media campaigns on all future actions are considered **necessary**, so as to introduce them to the people and create an initial interest to participate

"This is not a proposition... whatever they do; they first have to let us know it exists!"

- Especially in view of the forthcoming elections and given that Greeks are currently **less interested in participating**, due to economic crisis, it is imperative that campaigns are run, so as to **explain what is at stake nowadays**

"It is part of the game; of course they should run campaigns. Now that Europe is in a critical moment, they need to tell us why we should vote; if they leave this to national authorities, the elections will turn into a local political debate and their meaning will be lost"

APPENDIX - DISCUSSION GUIDE

ποιοτική έρευνα στην εμπλοκή των κατοίκων

στην ευρωπαϊκή ένωση

(δεκεμβριος 2013)

οδηγός συζήτησης

(εισαγωγή: ζητείται από κάθε συμμετέχοντα να παρουσιάσει τον εαυτό του, της με λίγα λόγια, λέγοντας ποιος, ποια είναι και τι κάνει κ.λπ.)

Θεμα 1

Βρεθήκαμε εδώ σήμερα όλοι μαζί για να συζητήσουμε σχετικά με την ευρωπαϊκή ένωση.

Θα μπορούσατε παρακαλώ να μου πείτε τι αρχικά σας έρχεται στο μυαλό ακουγοντας ευρωπαϊκή ένωση;

- αυθόρμητες αντιδράσεις
- διερεύνησε:
 - τη φύση των θεμάτων που αναφερθηκαν αυθόρμητα σχετικά με την ευρωπαϊκή ένωση
 - θετικές και αρνητικές αποψεις σχετικά με την ευρωπαϊκή ένωση
 - το βαθμό του αρχικού ενδιαφέροντος και της εμπλοκής των ερωτωμενων για θέματα σχετικά με την ευρωπαϊκή ένωση

Θεμα 2

Τώρα, σχετικά με ότι ξέρετε και με το τι πιστεύετε σχετικά για την Ε. Ε. : από που αυτή προέρχεται;

Από ποιες πηγές πληροφόρησης ενημερώνεστε ή ακούτε αποψεις σχετικά με την Ε.Ε. - παίρνοντας τη λέξη «πηγες» με την ευρύτερη έννοια, που κυμαίνονται από επίσημες πηγές πληροφόρησης μέχρι ανεπίσημες συζητήσεις με φίλους ή άλλους ανθρώπους... ;

- αυθόρμητες αντιδράσεις
- διερεύνησε:
 - το βαθμό της διαφοροποίησης των πηγών που αναφερθηκαν
 - τη φύση των εισαγομενων πληροφοριων του καθενος
 - ενδιαφερον / αξιοπιστια του καθενος

Θεμα3

Παμε τώρα να συζητήσουμε πιο συγκεκριμένα για το μέλλον της ευρωπαϊκής ένωσης και να κάνετε ερωτήσεις που έχετε κάνει και στον εαυτό σας για αυτό το θέμα.

Υπάρχουν ορισμένες πτυχές που θεωρείτε σημαντικές και θα θέλατε να ξέρετε και να κατανοήσετε καλύτερα όσον αφορά τον τρόπο με τον οποίο η ε. Ε. Δουλεύει και τις οδηγίες που παίρνει – καθώς δεν μπορείτε να πάρετε όλες τις πληροφορίες που θα θέλατε από τις πηγές που αναφέρατε νωρίτερα.

Για ποιες πτυχές θα επιθυμούσατε να μάθετε περισσότερα;

- αυθόρμητες αντιδράσεις
- διερεύνησε:
 - γενικές εντυπώσεις του καλού ή του κακού βαθμού γνώσης/ ικανοποίησης των θεμάτων αυτών.
 - την αντίληψη των μεγάλων προκλήσεων για την ε. Ε. Τα επόμενα χρόνια.
 - εκδηλώσεις από τους ερωτηθέντες της ανάγκης για καλύτερη γνώση και κατανόηση- σε ποια αντικείμενα πιο συγκεκριμένα; σε τι αυτές οι πληροφορίες που διατίθενται σήμερα για τα θέματα αυτά δεν είναι ικανοποιητικές;

Θεμα 4

Ως πολίτης, θα πρέπει να είσαι σε θέση να εκφράσεις τη γνώμη σου και να ακουστεί η φωνή σου όσον αφορά τις μελλοντικές κατευθύνσεις της ευρωπαϊκής ένωσης – αν θα εγκρίνεις ή θα απορρίψεις τέτοιες ή μια τέτοια κατεύθυνση, ή για οποιοδήποτε άλλο λόγο..

Πώς μπορείτε να το κάνετε αυτό σήμερα;

- αυθόρμητες αντιδράσεις
- διερεύνησε:
 - αντιληπτή ευκολία/ δυσκολία να εκφραστεί κάποιος και να κάνει τη φωνή του να ακουστεί για θέματα σχετικά με την ε. Ε. – με ποια μέσα;
 - αντιληπτοί λόγοι του γιατί είναι δύσκολο.
 - ειδικά θέματα για τα οποία οι ερωτηθέντες θα θέλουν ιδιαίτερα να εκφράσουν τη γνώμη τους και να ακουστούν ως πολίτες. Προσδοκίες από αυτή την αποψη.

Θεμα 5

Κάποιος μπορεί να σκεφτεί διαφορά μέσα με τα οποία οι ευρωπαίοι πολίτες σαν κι εμάς θα μπορούσαν να κάνουν τη φωνή τους να ακουστεί.

Επιτρέψτε μου να προτείνω να προσπαθήσουμε να σκεφτούμε κάθε δυνατό μέσο, απλά αφηνοντας τη φαντασία μας να τρεξεί, χωρίς να εγκαταλείψουμε μια ιδέα, ακόμη και αν δεν γνωρίζουμε προς το παρόν πως θα μπορούσε να εφαρμοστεί στην πράξη.

Τι θα μπορούσαμε να φανταστούμε;

- αυθόρμητες αντιδράσεις.
- παρακίνησε τη δημιουργικότητα της ομάδας ενθαρρύνοντας τους ερωτωμένους να «πηδούν» από τη μια ιδέα στην άλλη.

Θεμα 6

Τώρα προκειται να σας υποβάλλω σε διάφορες ιδέες που έχουν τεθεί νωρίτερα, σχετικά με τα μέσα που θα μπορούσαν να τεθούν σε εφαρμογή με σκοπό να επιτρέψουν στους πολίτες να ακουστεί καλύτερα η φωνή τους για θέματα που αφορούν την ε. Ε.

Θα σας ρωτήσω τι γνώμη έχετε για το καθένα.

- κάντε τους ερωτηθέντες να αντιδρούν σε κάθε πρόταση με τη σειρά, ζητώντας τους για την κάθε πρόταση το βαθμό του ενδιαφέροντος τους καθώς και τους λόγους.

A. μια υπηρεσία πληροφοριών για τη λειτουργία της ευρωπαϊκής ένωσης και τις πολιτικές της ε. Ε. , συμπεριλαμβανοντας ένα γραφείο πληροφόρησης ανοιχτό για το κοινό σε όλες τις μεγάλες πόλεις, μια ιστοσελίδα και μια υπηρεσία που θα απαντά γρήγορα σε τυχόν ερωτήσεις μέσω τηλεφώνου, ταχυδρομείου ή e- mail.

B. συζητήσεις που θα οργανώνονται σε μεγάλα μέσα ενημέρωσης μεταξύ του μέσου ορόυ των πολιτών και των ειδικών για ευρωπαϊκά θέματα σχετικά με τις κατευθύνσεις που λαμβάνονται από την ε. Ε.

Γ. δημοσκοπήσεις για την ε. Ε., οργανωμένες τακτικά σε όλη την ευρώπη, επιτρέποντας στους πολίτες να γνωρίζουν τι σκεφτόνται τόσο οι συμπατριώτες τους όσο και οι πολίτες των άλλων χωρών.

Δ. η δυνατότητα, που θα δίνεται αρκετές φορές το χρόνο, να συναντηθούν με τα μέλη του

ευρωπαϊκού κοινοβουλίου σας ή άλλων πολιτικών της ε. ε., στη χώρα που ζείτε.

Ε. διαβουλευσεις μέσω του διαδικτύου, οργανωμένες από την ευρωπαϊκή επιτροπή, για σημαντικές που πρέπει να ληφθούν στην ε. ε., ανοιχτές σε όλους τους πολίτες.

Ζ. παρομοίες διαβουλευσεις, που οργανώνονται από την εθνική μας κυβέρνηση.

Η. μια διαδραστική υπηρεσία που χρησιμοποιεί το διαδίκτυο και τα κοινωνικά δίκτυα για να συγκεντρώσει σε μόνιμη βάση τις απόψεις των πολιτών, τις επιθυμίες και τις επικρίσεις τους σχετικά με τις κατευθύνσεις που λαμβάνονται από την ε. ε.

Θ. ενημερωτικές εκστρατείες για να αναπτυχθεί πολύ πιο ενεργά απ' ό,τι τα προηγούμενα χρόνια, προκειμένου να ενθαρρύνουν τους πολίτες να συμμετέχουν στις συζητήσεις που προκειται να λάβουν χώρα και να λάβουν μέρος στις επερχόμενες εκλογές για τα μέλη του ευρωπαϊκού κοινοβουλίου την ερχόμενη ανότιξη.

Σας ευχαριστώ και πάλι για την συμμετοχή σας σε αυτή τη συζήτηση.

Εάν περάσουν από το μυαλό σας και άλλες ιδέες μετά τη συζήτηση, μη διστάσετε να μας ενημερώσετε.

(επικοινωνήστε μια σχετική διεύθυνση ηλεκτρονικού ταχυδρομείου που οι ερωτηθέντες θα μπορούν να χρησιμοποιήσουν για αυτό το σκοπό.)

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 Greek: Eurologos • © Notre Europe – Jacques Delors Institute

