



EUROSPHERE

COMPARATIVE STUDIES

Work Package 5.3 Report, 2011

The Role of SMOs/NGOs in the articulation of the European Public Sphere

**Acar Kutay
Alberto Arribas**

This paper can be downloaded without charge from:
<http://eurospheres.org/publications/workpackage-reports/>
ISSN 1890-5986

EUROSPHERE ONLINE WORKING PAPER SERIES

Title: WP5.3 – The Role of SMOs/NGOs in the articulation of the European Public Sphere
Author: Acar Kutay
Alberto Arribas
This version: October 2011
Webpage: <http://eurospheres.org/publications/workpackage-reports/>

© EUROSPHERE, 2011

<http://eurospheres.org>

© 2011 by authors

All rights reserved.

Short sections of text, not to exceed two paragraphs, may be quoted without explicit permission provided that full credit, including notice, is given to the source.

The views expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect those of the EUROSPHERE Project.

The statement of purpose for the EUROSPHERE Online Working Paper Series is available from the EUROSPHERE working papers website, <http://eurospheres.org/publications/workpackage-reports/>

Author Contact Information:

Acar Kutay

University of Bergen

Norway

Acar.Kutay@global.uib.no

ISSN 1890-5986 (online)

Table of Contents

1 Introduction	1
2 Civil society and Public Sphere: The State of the Art.....	1
2.1 The rising anti-immigration sentiments in Europe.....	3
3 Civil society, uncivil society and Public Sphere	4
3.1 Uncivil society and anti-diversity	5
3.2 Studying the role of civil society actors in articulation of European public sphere.....	8
4 Research methodology	9
4.1 Studying Anti-diversity and anti-racists discourse in European civil society.....	11
4.2 Selected anti-diversity groups	12
4.3 Selected anti-racist groups	14
5. Citizen's organizations, anti-diversity and anti-racism	16
5.1 Patterns of anti-diversity discourse	17
5.2 State's role in immigrants' resistance to adaptation:	21
6 Anti-racist groups and diversity	23
6.1 Anti-racist groups, public sphere, and political rights	24
7. European Integration and national civil society actors	25
7.1 Anti-diversity and EU integration	25
7.2 Anti-racism and EU integration	27
8. European public sphere and national civil society actors	28
8.1 Anti-diversity and EPS	28
8.2 Anti-racism and EPS	30
9 Concluding remarks	32
References	33
ANNEX 1	35

The Roles of SMOs/NGOs in the Articulation of EPS

Acar Kutay and Alberto Arribas

1 Introduction

The aim of our report is to examine the role of the organized civic actors within civil society in the articulation of a European public sphere (EPS). The report primarily contributes to the state-of-the-art with its empirical results that challenge the traditional theories of (European) public spheres by bringing the role of ‘uncivil society’ in public deliberation. We commence from the initial premise of public spheres, which is the translation of public deliberation into laws and policies. However, we concentrate on the far right anti-immigrant civic organizations, and compare them with the anti-racist organizations. This focus contradicts with the claim that public concerns (in this case mobilized through organized actors of civil society) foster democratic public deliberation, and in turn contribute to the nourishing of democratic citizens.

To outline, the report firstly draws a review on the previous studies which concentrated on the relations between civic action and European public spheres. Secondly, it elaborates the three theoretical sources: normative studies on the pertinence between public deliberation and public sphere; the studies on the notion of uncivil society; and far right. Thirdly, it interrogates the views of the anti-diversity and anti-racist groups about diversity, European polity and existing communication channels in Europe. Further, it elaborates on the relation between the views about a diverse society, Europeanization, (willingness to) interact beyond the territories and addressing European institutions and using transnational communication channels.

2 Civil society and Public Sphere: The State of the Art

The aim of our report is to examine the role of the organized civic actors within civil society in the articulation of a European public sphere (EPS). Social theory has approached the collective social action and organized forms of civic interactions in European studies within the perspectives of social movements and civil society. In common, both approaches studied social action as phenomenon directed vis-à-vis a sovereign, in this case the European governance. These studies limited the definition of European civil society (ECS) and its immediate impact on the emergence of public sphere(s) to Brussels-based NGOs and supranational collaborations, such as European Social Forum (Doerr 2006). In this respect, some scholars

have focused on the Brussels based NGO networks, as transmission belts (Steffek and Nanz 2007), considering that they would connect the interest of society to European governance¹. Regarding Europeanization of collective action, the literature of social movements concentrated on ‘contention’ to European policies, exerted both at European and national level (Imig and Tarrow 2001, Della Porta 20009).

In sum, these studies have elaborated the pertinence of the notions of ECS and EPS by examining the social actions which addressed the European institutions. While the central argument to the transmission belt argument is supranationalization of ECS, the contention argument has also examined the local protests to European policies as intrinsic to the EPS. It should also be noted that ECS has not only be conceptualized within the scope of an action – either institutionalized or non-formal. Scholars of political sociology, for example, have focused on ECS as social constituency, complementary to the political constituency of European polity (Trenz and Fossum 2006). Defined as a spatial domain², contrary to the actor based approaches, social constituency even contains silence (or indifference) intrinsic to conceptualization of ECS. Hence, it argues that the negative referendum results in the Netherlands and France on the EU-constitution-making process played a constitutive role on EU political constituency by linking the public concerns to polity building attempts.

We agree with these previous studies that social action (or even silence) oriented towards the EU institutions and EU policies play a functional role in linking the public interest to EU polity building processes. But we have a broader scope to the EPS: we approach EPS as trans-European phenomenon, containing the discourses, actions and networking of civil society actors within Europe. However, we elaborate this relation through examining the notion of ‘uncivil society’ (see Chambers and Kopstein 2001). The Habermasian interpretation to the relation between civil society and public sphere has pointed out two roles of associational life: a) fostering public deliberation, thus asserting communicative power; and b) transforming the individuals into liberal citizens, e.g. identity/formation (Habermas 1996, 1992). This argument stems from separation of the system (the state) and life-world (civil society); this separation, yet, does not question the content of the discussion taking place within the life-world. In turn, it takes for granted that civil society liberalizes and democratizes the system. Nonetheless, as Chambers and Kopstein (2001) and Ruzza (2009) draw, societal associations could also

¹ Civic actor organized at supranational (European) level has also been studied from the perspective of governance and interest politics. These studies, however, narrowed their focus on the incorporation of the societal groups to EU politics, and thereby focused on the role and influence of the organized civil society (OCS) in the EU decision-making (Zimmel and Freise 2006; Kochler-Koch and Finke 2007; Greenwood 2007a, 2007b). These three approaches in common argue that this process could legitimize EU governance¹.

² Defining civil society as a spatial domain in this case corresponds to the structural-functional differentiation, i.e. system and life-world. That is to say, system of European governance refers to system, whereas ECS to life-world.

organize around ideas which are not compatible with the tenets of liberal democracy. Illustrated as xenophobia, hatred, and fostering different modes of exclusion, these ideas would characterize ‘uncivil society’. Argued in this way, henceforth, the contribution of the civic organizations to the public deliberation and identity-formation is not necessarily conducive to democratization.

The report considers the role of civil society in articulation of public sphere as such: fostering discourses which have impact on public deliberations and which are translated into laws and policies. To the concern of European polity this understanding implies the transfer of discourses which emerged from within civil society to European level through public spheres. The report interrogates the views of the civic groups about diversity, European polity and existing communication channels in Europe. It elaborates the relation between the views about a diverse society, Europeanization, (willingness to) interact beyond the territories and addressing European institutions. Central to the concern of ‘uncivil society’, the discourse of exclusion that is flourished from mobilized civic actors is particularly important. This focus enables to portray the scope of exclusion from public spheres (and spaces).

2.1 The rising anti-immigration sentiments in Europe

There have been several events considered to be the signs of rising anti-immigrant (and anti-diversity) sentiments in Europe. Some of the very recent examples can be given as: the recent expulsion of (around 1000) Roma people from France, violence breaks out organized by English Defence League in Bradford, attacks to immigrants in southern Italy (Calabria) by the locals, Italian government’s proposal for expulsion of EU citizens (addressing particularly the Roma) who lack sufficient financial wealth, several attacks to Roma people in Czech Republic, Slovakia and Hungary, and shootings of immigrants in Sweden (Malmo). Burgeoning of the anti-immigrant parties and their growing electoral base has also been conceived of as the signs of rising anti-immigrant attitudes in Europe³. Based on such context, the report concentrates on the organized civic action, which is considered to embody ‘uncivil features’, yet it does not have an ambition to illustrate the far right phenomenon in Europe. These parties, nationalist in orientation are usually in Eurosceptic, such as the True Finns in Finland, Northern League in Italy, Dutch Freedom Party. The True Fins, which had 19% electoral support in April 2011, for

³ Several examples to the far right anti-immigration parties can be given: Austria, Freedom Party (FPÖ); Belgium, Flemish Bloc (VB); Denmark, Danish People’s Party (DPP); France, National Front (FN); Germany, Republican Party (REP), German People’s Union (DVU); National Democratic Party (NPD); Greece (Hellenic Front); Hungary, Jobbik Party; Italy, Northern League; the Netherlands, Pim Fortuyn’s List (LPF) and Freedom Party; Norway, Progress Party; Portugal, Popular Party; Sweden, Sweden’s Democrats (SD); Switzerland, Swiss People’s Party (SVP); and UK (BNP)

example, are critical of the bailouts to the countries which experience economic problems, such as Greece and Portugal. The rise of resentment to bailouts through far right is considered as European Tea Party⁴.

3 Civil society, uncivil society and Public Sphere

By examining the pertinence between uncivil society and public spheres, the report questions the argument which asserts that civil society organizations are prerequisites of a vibrant democracy⁵. Fung (2003) delineates six ways by which societal associations contribute to democracy: “intrinsic value of associational life, fostering civic virtues and teaching political skills, offering resistance to power and checking government, improving quality and equality of representation, facilitating public deliberation and creating opportunities for citizens and groups to participate”. Hence, associations are considered as crucial components of well-ordered democracies. According to this positive approach to civil society, existence of civic associations in a society is considered as an indicator of vibrant democracy. Thus, according to this view, CSOs are *sine qua non* of democratic public spheres.

In the report, among the six contributions which were mentioned by Fung, we concentrate on the functions of associations in fostering public deliberation. Habermas (1996) claims that the role of civil society is to bring issues of common concern to public arena, thus linking opinion making publics and decision-making publics. Our aim to examine the pertinence between civil society and public sphere is explicated by Habermas (1996) with the notion of ‘communicative power’: the roles of civil society, according to Habermas, were considered, firstly, to articulate and carry public deliberation and enable identity-formation. Habermas asserts that the public deliberation which emerges from within civil society could generate liberal values in society, thus transforming the ‘illiberal ideas’ to democratic ones. The latter aspect is a concern of identity-formation –how individuals become democratic citizens. Habermas’ *communicative power* notion entails an argument that the discourse which is originated from peripheral publics is linked to political public spheres through the medium of media and political parties. In other words, according to Habermas civil society actors are sensors and watchdogs of democracy, but they do not have to solve the problems that they bring into public debate.

⁴ Peter Spiegel, Anger begins to infect Europe’s prosperous core, *Financial Times*, 11 April 2011.

⁵ Civil society is composed of associational and non-associational societal activities, media, work place etc. However, we focus here on the associational dimension of civil society.

The discussion is pertinent with the public sphere research in the sense that it focuses on the role of the associations in creating public deliberation and communicative power. The latter implies influencing the public deliberation, linking this to political public spheres, thus, translating communication into laws. Habermas (1996) asserts that the maxim of reference during this process is the universally valid claims, based on liberal values. Public deliberation constitutes a decisive place in Habermas' procedural deliberative democracy model. It is necessary to sketch it.

Habermas' democracy model (1996b) is a critique of communitarian reading of republican thought, which concentrates on the ethical construction of polity. Habermas (Ibid) draws a critique that the community building should not be grounded on the ethno-cultural references, but universal moral concerns, e.g. on Kantian morality. The following questions, then, to Habermas, must be responded by transcending the territorial references: how to treat the minorities, who the members of the community should be, what are the roles of the state and how the public should adapt to the requirements of a diverse society. Habermas, then, draws our attention from ethical construction of community to moral construction based on political discourse.

3.1 Uncivil society and anti-diversity

Even though organized civic action is considered intrinsic to democratization and identity-formation (e.g. nourishing democratic citizens), in the report, we endeavour to argue that not necessarily all civic communication and action result in the emergence of a democratic public sphere. Referring to Habermas' model that civil society could have impact on the public debate and nourishing of (democratic) citizens, in this case, we focus on the segment of civic action which is considered "uncivil" (Ruzza 2009) or "bad civil society" (Chambers and Kopstein 2001). Referring to Ruzza (2009) to clarify what we mean by uncivil society, an uncivil society could have the following features: being racist, nationalist and populist, biologically essentialist and territorially and culturally exclusionist. In line with this argument, we examine the social groups, which we name anti-diversity groups.

Ruzza (2009) points out that 'uncivil' feature could be observed among both left and right oriented groups⁶. However, anti-diversity groups are mostly associated with the far right. The identifying features of uncivil society were defined as rejection of democratic norms and promoting exclusionist sentiments, if not hatred (Chambers and Kopstein 2001). For example,

⁶ The common denominator of Ruzza (2009) for being 'uncivil' is commuting to the illegal actions and using violence.

by focusing on the political parties, Rydgren (2007) outlines the identifying features of the radical right as being xenophobic, ethno-nationalist, socio-culturally authoritarian and anti-system populist.

Uncivil society offers an alternative type of political participation, in a context when the political institutions loose legitimacy. Uncivil society, to Ruzza (2009) “relocates the political exclusion in the social arena, thus articulating the anti-political sentiments of large sectors of the population”. Uncivil society stays at the border of democratically acceptable and unacceptable behaviour (Ruzza 2009). Protest, public speeches and publishing are considered within the scope of democratic rights; however, “racially abusive anti-immigrant campaigns” (Ruzza 2009), dispersing hatred and using violence exceed the limits of legal actions.

In this respect, we inspire, on the one hand, from the studies which bring the notion of uncivil society into debates about the contributions of associational life to democracy; and, on the other, from the contemporary studies on the radical right. Yet, our aim is to incorporate these debates into the research on European public sphere. Whereas Habermas’ contribution informs us about the communicative power of the associations in such a way to influence politics, the notion of ‘uncivil society’ notifies that not all civic deliberation may qualify democracy. Chambers and Kopstein (2001) underline a danger of dispersion of exclusionary discourse into the mainstream discourse. The ideas of the radical right could, then, extend to political space. Zizek, in this respect, in a recent article published in Guardian, in 3 October 2010, argues that now anti-immigrant groups set the public discourse, in such a way that “the things which could not be discussed ten years ago now are considered acceptable”. We take this notice seriously. The discourse that emerged from within civil society does not necessarily entail liberal elements. Our focus on the anti-diversity groups, hence, inquiries into what are these things which are discussed and received public support. Zizek, in the same newspaper article noted above, presents also a new concept, ‘reasonable racism’ to illustrate the shifting aspects of exclusion. This concept implies that the current anti-immigration sentiments now entail ‘love the host country or leave’ and not to disturb the host majority.

From France to Germany, from Austria to Holland, in the new spirit of pride in one’s own cultural and historical identity, the main parties now find it acceptable that immigrants are guests who have to accommodate themselves to the cultural values that defines the host society – ‘it is our country, love it, or, leave it’ is the message.

Focusing, therefore, on anti-diversity far right groups, we argue that some civic organizations can promote exclusionary and anti-democratic (if not anti-modern) sentiments within civil society. Moreover, these groups can also have impact on general public debate. Hence, we endeavour to draw the patterns of exclusion (and contestation to exclusion) within public sphere. By concentrating on the comparison on the anti-diversity and anti-racist associations, we endeavour to delineate who are included (and excluded) from public debate, and who are considered illegitimate (or semi-legitimate) constituents of society (Sicakkan 2009, Eurosphere Research Programme). In this respect, we interrogate the perception of the anti-diversity and anti-racist groups about a diverse society in relation to their attitudes towards European integration and willingness to engage in European communication. We study these aspects because we endeavour to draw a correlation between the attitudes of the civic actors' towards diversity and 1) Euroscepticism (or Europeanization) and 2) engaging in European communication.

Whereas anti-racist groups are associated with a multicultural idea, either presented in an individualistic (Kymlicka) or a communitarian (Taylor) form, it might be expected that anti-diversity groups would favour homogenous society, which would entail mono-lingualism, mono ethnic composition and a uniform socio-cultural morality. Nonetheless, according to Ryggren (2007), this might not be the case. He points out that contemporary far right involves aspects of pluralism, which he calls 'ethno-pluralism'. This idea could trace back to the writings of German philosopher Herder; however, in contemporary era it was elaborated by the French *Nouvelle Droite*. Ryggren (2007) argues that *Nouvelle Droite*, appeared during the 1960s and 1970s in France, was also inspired by the Gramscian notion of cultural hegemony. The former implies that it did not involve in party politics, but engaged a *Kulturkampf* against the Left. To Ryggren (2007:244), the notion of ethno-pluralism, originated from this French group, suggests "to preserve the unique national characters of different peoples, [hence] they have to be kept separate". Compared with traditional racism, ethno-pluralism does not suggest hierarchy between ethnicities; they are merely "incompatible and incommensurable" (Ryggren 2007). Yet, whereas old racist doctrine suggested subordination, the goal of ethno-pluralism is expulsion (Ibid.). Further, to Ryggren (Ibid), this thought draws particularly the Muslim immigrants as threatening to European values, since they are the "least commensurable and the least inclined to assimilation". Enlightenment, then, can be used in a fundamentalist way to exclude those aspects which are considered untenable with European society (Fekete 2006; Habermas 2008). Ethno-pluralism, therefore, does not offer assimilation, but suggests that immigrants should not integrate into society – because they cannot. Those groups which cannot

comply with social cultural morality are excluded from public spaces in order not to disturb society (Zizek 2010).

3.2 Studying the role of civil society actors in articulation of European public sphere

European Public Spheres can be articulated by the social actors in terms of discourse, action, and networking. *EPS is firstly articulated transnationally through discourse.* This entails dispersion of discourse within European space, and its subsequent impact on decision making processes. The discourse that is being carried by the social actors, however, is not necessarily pertinent with liberal values. *EPS is articulated secondly through action:* this can entail two types of actions. The first one entails the actions transcending the territorial boundaries. This concerns engaging in an activity beyond the territorial boundaries in order to achieve a domestic goal or promote a global issue. Main criterion, in this case, is that the action is conducted outside the national territories. The second type of actions includes the actions within national domain which are related to a transnational phenomenon. The notion of horizontal Europeanization of Koopmans (2004) and domestication of contention (Imig and Tarrow 2001) can be given as examples to the latter. *EPS is thirdly articulated through networking:* this implies being part of an institutional structure, or informal collaborative structures. It is possible to observe both of the cases in Europe space, i.e. European Social Forum (Doer and Haug 2006) and European lobby organizations. Action, discourse and networking relate to public spheres to the extent that they relate to public debate and have impact on the decision-making structures.

In sum, we start from the pertinence between associational life and democracy. We draw the tenets of uncivil society. It is argued that associational life could articulate ‘unwanted’ discourses through EPS. Some scholars drew a line a between ‘good’ and ‘bad civil society’ (Chambers and Kopstein 2001), thus addressing that modern democracies should also take the negative implications of an associational life and collective action of citizens. What we particularly focus on is the role of civil society in creating public deliberation and having impact on laws and policies. We compare the discourses created by the selected organizations on the following ground: public sphere may contain illiberal ideas as well as it accommodates the liberal ones. In this respect, this report examines anti-diversity groups and compares them with the anti-racist groups. The question concerns what are the discourses on exclusion, and on which level they oscillate, i.e., between a modest cultural incommensurability and extreme chauvinistic sentiments. It would be expected that public sphere would transform these views into more democratic ones and hold the decision making processes under scrutiny, so that

elements which contradict with the public use of reason would not translate into policies and laws. In this report, we narrow our focus with the discourses. Further research, however can trace the link between the social actors, the positions of the political parties and policies which are adapted in national and EU level. In such a systemic study, the impacts of the communicative power of the social actors, understood as anonymous and formal deliberations, can further shed light on the impact of civil society (including uncivil society) on public administration.

One of the important aspects inherent to concept of public sphere is that communications reflect upon, or are performed for (and to) an audience. For the concern of our research, identification of the audience of each discourse can help in our main research objective of interrogating the role of the societal organizations in the articulation of EPS⁷.

4 Research methodology

In our research, first we conducted a qualitative-comparative analysis of all NGOs and Social Movement Organizations included in the Eurosphere project, based primarily on the Country Reports data⁸. Our goal was to cover the organisations' views regarding Eurosphere's main themes:

- What are the SMOs/NGOs' views on diversity?
- How do they conceive Europe and the ethno-national diversity within Europe?
- What are their main discourses about citizenship, ethno-national minorities and immigration?
- How do they understand the EU polity?
- What are their views on the EPS?
- Are they involved in European and global networks?

After that first qualitative-comparative analysis we elaborated a document that helped us develop a preliminary selection of SMOs/NGOs' groups for the further in-depth comparative

⁷ We should also clarify the definition of articulation. To articulate on the one hand means advanced manners in communication, including expressing one's ideas and feelings clearly. For instance, if you articulate something, you say it very clearly, so that each word or syllable can be heard, expressing yourself easily or characterized by clear expressive language. Besides, according to this definition articulate is used as an adjective; e.g. "articulate speech" and "an articulate orator". On the other hand, *to* articulate also means to form a joint or connect by joints. These two meanings of the verb are relevant for our research: 1) which groups express their ideas more clearly than others (this concerns both the self-perception and perception of others), and more clearly understood; 2) whether EPS can be conceptualized as a discursive space which is articulated through several conflicting discourses, including anti-racism and anti-diversity.

⁸ <http://eurospheres.org/publications/country-reports/>

analysis⁹, based on the institutional and interview data entered into the project knowledge base. Out of the 47 remaining organizations (an overall 190 interviews), we selected for this report those groups/categories which are more relevant for Work Package 5.3, and which comprised a larger number of organizations: anti-racist organizations and anti-diversity organizations (see Table 1).

⁹ Within this process we considered that some countries should be fully or partially discarded from the analysis for different reasons: A) The Belgian and Czech reports do not present the information in a detailed manner, lacking a clear differentiation of responses for every actor and making the data incomparable with other reports. B) The Netherlands CR has only one interviewee per organization. C) The French report includes three Corsican organizations with very little information, which should be discarded, whereas the other two organizations are perfectly valid for the analysis. D) The German report includes a political party as an anti-diversity organization, which should be discarded, whereas the other three German organizations are perfectly valid for the analysis.

Table 1. The list of organizations selected for qualitative in-depth analysis

CLASIFICATION	COUNTRY	SMOs/NGOs Short Name	SMOs/NGOs
ANTI-DIVERSITY	AUSTRIA	MA	Moschee Ade Islam –phobic, social cultural authoriatarianism It gets support from Austrian freedom party, extreme right
	BULGARIA	BNA	Bulgarian National Alliance xenophobic, territorially and culturally exclusionist
	DENMARK	TDA	The Danish Association centre-right conservative, nationalist and populist, social and culturally authoritarian
	ITALY	FN	Forza Nuova xenophobic, territorially and culturally exclusionist
ANTI-RACIST	NORWAY	ARC	Anti-Rasistisk senter anti-racist, support the rights of the immigrants
	FINLAND	ENAR	ENAR Finland anti-racist, support the rights of the immigrants
		FMN	Free Mobility Network free mobility
	UK	NB	No Borders free mobility
	GERMANY	TGD	Türkische Gemeinde immigrant organizations against exclusion
	SPAIN	EA	Ecologistas en Acción environmentalists, anti-racist, eco-feminist
		REDI	REDI anti-racist, support the rights of the immigrants
	FRANCE	FASTI	The Federation institutional data of Solidarity Associations Immigrant Workers class-oriented anti-racist approach and pro-immigration
	AUSTRIA	BNC	Ehe ohne Grenzen free mobility and family unification

4.1 Studying Anti-diversity and anti-racists discourse in European civil society

The report elaborates the perceptions of the selected organizations in each category about diversity, the future of the EU's political re-structuring and willingness to involve in European communication channels. The following table demonstrates the questions that we posed.

Table 2. Questions Posed in Comparative Analyses Between The Anti-diversity, and Anti-Racist Groups

Variable	Diversity	Restructuring of European Polity	European Public Sphere
Diversity definition	X		
Groups' claims	X		
Attitude to Diversity (advantage or disadvantage)	X		
Public institutions and socio-political requirements of diverse society	X		
The aspects to which immigrants should adapt	X		
State's role in immigrants' adaptation	X		
the claims of the selected groups and their self perception of correspondence with the dominant public opinion	X		X
the claims of the selected groups and their self perception of getting support from the public for their opinions	X		X
Which group of immigrants should be let into the country	X		
development of the EU polity		X	
the impact of the EU integration on the diversity		X	
impact on the gender		X	
EU's power to grant minority rights		X	
The reasons for not accepting a country member of the EU		X	
Self perception of ontology of EPS			X
EPS and the domains of exclusion			X
Collaboration with other organizations			X
Membership in other networks			X
Addressee of the political actions			X

4.2 Selected anti-diversity groups

Following Ruzza (2009), anti-diversity associations can be categorized as follows: xenophobic, nationalist and populist, biologically essentialist and territorially or culturally exclusionist. Xenophobic groups are associated with the classical racism, particularly with the neo-Nazi groups. Some political parties, such as *Swiss Democrats* (SD) and the French *Front National* are considered to belong to this group (Ruzza 2009 94). Territorially protectionist uncivil

society is based on an idealization of a territorial community; Euroscepticism can be a constituent of this thought (Ruzza 2009: 94). Nationalist uncivil society emphasizes the “classic nation-building strategies of contemporary nation states” (Ruzza 2009:94). Populist uncivil society is anti-elitist in nature, and it is based on elite (usually corrupted) and the mass divide. Ryggren (2007) defines that this far right now includes the immigrants as opposed to the pure people conception. Populism is “exclusivist to the extent that it defines ‘the people’ as its own social category of provenance, which has a self-evident right to impose its will on society (for instance a process of self-moralization), and which excludes the minority constituents of society” (Ruzza 2009:96). We will, however, use the umbrella concept of anti-diversity, though the groups may contain all of the aforementioned features, or just one. The anti-diversity groups which are selected for this research are Moschee Ade, Bulgarian National Alliance, Forza Nova and Danish Association.

Moschee Ade (MA) is a citizens’ initiative which campaigns against the extension of a mosque in the 20th district of Vienna. The initiative is run by people from the neighbourhood; it ostensibly refers to noise disturbance and the lack of parking sites. Its (not very well) hidden agenda is the fight against Islam and its visibility in public. Since it was founded in 2007, it has enjoyed much public response, not least due the support by the Austrian Freedom party, neo-Nazi and right-wing extremist organisations. This association can be defined as culturally exclusionist, while exerting social cultural authoritarianism (Mokre 2010, Austrian Country Report).

Bulgarian National Alliance (BNA) identifies itself as a patriotic, nationally oriented, cultural and educational organization. It is oriented to nation preservation and national development and is characterized by explicit Anti-European and anti- Internationalism views. BNA is often blamed for fascist and neo-Nazi views. BNA was founded in 2001 with the mission to reassert the traditional social values and to revive the might of Bulgaria. BNA defines itself as an extraordinary organization of nationally conscious Bulgarians. The goals of BNA are: building a strong and independent Bulgaria, which is economically powerful and stable, beautiful and clean, free of criminals and ensuring work for everyone; accomplishment of the sheltered ideals of the ancestors through protection of the national unity of Bulgarians and restoration of the Bulgarian nation (Zografova et al 2010, Bulgaria Country Report). It can be argued that, BNA favours xenophobic, territorially and culturally exclusionist, and biologically essentialist sentiments.

The Danish Association focuses on the issues of immigration and integration. The aim is to ensure the survival of Danish language and culture which it perceives to be threatened by

immigration. The organisation was originally established in 1981 on the initiative of surviving members of the Danish resistance movement from WWII, and it is highly nationalistic. The association thinks that the Danish society is in danger of disruption because of the cultural mix. And it perceives the idea of Denmark as a homogeneous society as a positive thing to be preserved. It is the only way to ensure stability, since integration has failed everywhere in Europe. Regarding the EU, the association is generally EU sceptical and believes that Denmark should influence the agenda to revise the immigration policies (Pristed Nielsen 2010, Danish Country Report). Danish Association favours populism; in addition to elite vs. people divide this populism entails anti immigrant elements.

Forza Nuova (FN) is a far right political movement, which has a radical anti-immigration and anti-EU position. It is often described as nationalist and neo-fascist. It is a member of the European National Front. FN organizes conferences against Islam and demonstrations against G8 and capitalism.

4.3 Selected anti-racist groups

It should be noted that the selected anti-racist actors work particularly against discrimination and exclusion. This categorization does not imply that other organizations do not have anti-racist and pro-diversity sentiments. In our sample of 47 organizations, only five of the organizations favoured anti-diversity attitudes, while the rest proved not to be against a diverse society. The latter includes the organizations of gender, social exclusion, and ethno-religious minorities, pro and anti European movement, trade unions, environmentalists, human rights and alternative globalization.

We examine Anti-Rasistisk Senter (ARS), Norway; European Network Against Racism (ENAR) Finland; Free Mobility Network, FMH (Finland); No Borders (NB), UK; Türkische Gemeinde (TG), Germany; The Federation institutional data of Solidarity Associations Immigrant Workers (FASTI), France; Ecologistas en Acción (EA), Spain; Ehe ohne Grenzen (BNC), Austria.

Anti-racist associations can have different understanding of anti-racism. They can target the ethnic minorities, fighting against socio-political discrimination (ARS and REDI). They can favour free-mobility (NB, FMH and BNC). The associations of ethnic minorities and immigrant organizations can also form one type of an anti-racist organization. Some associations can narrow their focus, such as to family-unification (BNC) and to the immigrants which are in the labour market (FASTI). The latter also is an example of a class approach to

anti-racism. Environmentalist and social ecologist organizations can also work against discrimination of the minorities and anti-racism.

The Anti-Racist Center aims to mobilize the minority groups against discrimination, racism and inequality by empowering them and increasing their consciousness of their status and rights in the society. It does this by actively involving themselves in individual cases of discrimination and racism as well as by propagating antiracist views within the Norwegian public sphere as well as by working to influence the public institutions and governments on policies that are related with discrimination and racism (Sicakkan 2010, Norwegian Country Report).

ENAR Finland aims at combating xenophobia, anti-Semitism and Islamophobia, and promoting equal treatment of native citizens and immigrants. ENAR Finland has approximately ten member associations (exact information not available). ENAR Finland does not have any permanent or full-time staff but is to a large extent run a chairperson. As an anti-racist actor, ENAR Finland organizes annual round table discussions and offers lectures on anti-discrimination to schools and various branches of the public service system.

Free Mobility Network (FMH) criticizes the Finnish immigration policy as being too strict, the authorities for making arbitrary decisions on asylum cases and the Finnish police for being anti-diversity and brutal in their actions. At the European level, the network opposes the building of a “Fortress Europe”. The network has campaigned against residence permits that do not allow their holders to work or study.

No Borders (NB) is grassroots network of groups which struggle for the freedom of movement for all and an end to all migration controls. *Türkische Gemeinde (TG)* is the representation of migrants (especially of Turkish origin), taking strong stance against discrimination and in favour of equality. *REDI*'s main aim is to fight for the rights of the immigrants. It is a grassroots network with more than 120 organizations in all of Spain.

The Federation institutional data of Solidarity Associations Immigrant Workers (FASTI) is a very large, decentralized organization; composed to day by 66 associations (ASTI) meant to defend the rights of the immigrant workers in France. Created in 1967, it was the first organization constituted around the struggle of the migrants in the shantytowns (bidonville) all around Paris. The 200 associations gathered in FASTI stayed as the only representative bodies of the immigrants in France until 1981, when immigrants received the association rights. The first associations of the immigrants in France was build on the bases of the ASTIs. The movement advocates solidarity between immigrants and French population based on the rights equality between immigrants (men and women) and French. The first orientation was the daily

help, the amelioration of the life and working conditions of the migrants, including: literacy courses, accommodation health, workers rights, and administrative questions.

Ecologistas en Accion (EA) is a grassroots confederation of urban and rural groups working on social ecology, with strong eco-feminist and anti-racist stances. The foundation of *Ehe ohne Grenzen (BNC)* was a reaction to a new, more restrictive Austrian asylum and immigration law, issued in 2006. The initiative defines itself as a platform for bi-national families and partnerships and works as a pressure group against restrictions for bi-national couples, caused by immigration law. Its activities range from demonstrations and lobbying to the support of affected couples.

5. Citizen's organizations, anti-diversity and anti-racism

To elaborate on the discourses of the selected actors about diversity, the report poses the following questions: which groups are considered as relevant for defining a diverse society; perceptions on the ethno-national diverse societies; and attitude towards diverse societies. Moreover, the report detects whether the public institutions should be adapted to meet the requirements of ethno-national minorities and whether the state should react to immigrants that are not willing to adapt to certain aspects of the host country's way of life. The next question posed in this respect concerns the selected organization's perception on the adaptation of immigrants to the certain aspects of national culture. Last, it asks which groups should be let into the country.

When it is asked which groups in society they find relevant for the definition of a diverse society, anti-diversity groups mentioned mostly national belonging and ethnic groups. This finding affirms the literature which points out that far right groups are ethno-nationally oriented (Rydgren 2007). Further, anti-diversity groups have a negative approach to diverse society. Majority of the respondents from the anti-diversity groups conceives of the diversity as a disadvantage for the society in achieving social cohesion, creating solidarity, achieve women's rights and creating a national identity. For example, the FN members criticize and reject the contemporary notion of diversity. First, there are many immigrants having different characteristics. Second, there is an economic problem due to "the presence of several hungry mouths" (Saletnich, FN). Third, the current Italian situation is such that "there is no more a strong identity but many weak identities which raise their voice to defend themselves (Saletnich, FN). Hence, to FN, immigration is a danger for social cohesion. Current

immigration is defined by the FN as a “mass invasion” and “demographic tsunami” (FN’s political document).

The members of the BNA, Moshee Ade and the Danish Association also think that contemporary notion of diversity has disadvantages for society. One of the respondent from BNA states that diversity could lead to conflict in a given society: “The mutual co-habitation sooner or later leads to the conflicts and to some points of contact with the other ethnic groups that lead to dangerous relations (BNA)”.

5.1 Patterns of anti-diversity discourse

Based on EUROSPHERE empirical findings, we can draw the following patterns within the discourses of anti-diversity groups. Anti-diversity groups favour *anti-immigration sentiments*; however, there are differences about these sentiments within the selected groups. While some of the respondents from the anti-diversity groups favour strictly restricting further immigration, others show tendency of allowing different groups of immigrants, including primarily the highly educated people and labour migrants, refugees and asylum seekers, co-ethnics, culturally/religiously similar immigrants and also Muslim migrants.

Some differences about the attitudes to immigration are observed within the organization. For example, the members in BNA have different opinions about the migrants who would be let into the country. One of them is strictly against the Muslim immigrants (together with immigrants with health problems). While others are not against the Muslim immigrants, since “they should keep the order to be controlled like the all other migrants”. The BNA members, however, agree that high-skilled migrants should be let into the country, if there is labour shortage in the country. This view, letting the high-skilled to the country is also shared by the other organizations. For instance, although MA does not have a declared position on immigration, one of the members welcomes “all migrants who are being use of the country”, including labour, economic and Muslim migrants. Yet, Danish Association defends strong anti-immigration sentiments as well as a motto of Denmark for Danes (Pristed Nilsen 2010). Forza Nova on the other is strictly against the non-EU immigrants.

One of the features of the anti-diversity groups, except the Danish Association, that are examined in this report, is that they foster a feeling of hatred towards certain groups in the society, such as defending anti-Roma and anti-Semitism, and fostering homophobia and Islamophobia. However, the focus of the group which is excluded differs in each organization. Whereas the focus of BNA and FN includes all of these aforementioned aspects, the MA particularly concentrates on the visibility of Islam in the society. To illustrate the attitudes

towards the Roma, one of the BNA members suggests “suspending the legal rights of the gypsies”. Forza Nova, on the hand, advocates expulsion of the non-European immigrants (FN political document): “Human repatriation, rapid and total, for all non-European legal and illegal, Islamic and none, fundamentalists and moderates”. This position was also mentioned by one of the members of the FN, “our position of human repatriation: go home! (Corregiari, FN).

Despite the fact that Anti-diversity groups are territorially, ethnically and culturally exclusionist, categorically they were not against the notion of diversity. Rather, they proved to be against the current notion of diversity. In other words, the exclusionary discourse of the anti-diversity is not necessarily inspired from homogenous society descriptions. In terms of FN, the opposition to immigration is not inspired by a desire for strict homogeneity; considering Italians also immigrated into several countries (Fabbri 2010). FN members assert that the cultural enrichment originating from the encounter with other groups is possible and it has already experienced in Italian history. A respondent from Forza Nova referred to the ethno-plural experience of the Roman Empire and stated that: “I believe it is a positive aspect for the whole culture of a single country, if there is a reciprocal exchange allowing the enrichment of communities” (FN). However, the same respondent on the other hand expressed that non-European culture, particularly Islamic culture, could not adapt to European culture. Therefore, the members of FN address that in recent era homogeneity makes robust societies; however, diverse societies are fragile. Lack of a strong culture inhibits social integrity since society is fragmented into many different cultures.

One of the members of the Danish Association also thinks in a similar way with the members of the FN: “There are many national minorities in Europe and this is the richness of the European society that all these groups live together. We also have a common denominator which is Christianity as our common cultural heritage, secularity and the ancient Greece. The Islamic culture is very different in terms of the understanding of life and of justice -lack of democracy, human rights and gender equality”. The conclusion to be drawn is that differences are accepted, but non-European values, particularly Islam, are perceived as not compatible with Western civilization. Further, their openness to ethnic differences is pertinent with the ethno-national perspective, a perspective which describes their contemporary attitudes towards the societal composition. This observation is parallel with the doctrine on ethno-pluralism - the position of new far right groups about diversity.

For the populist Danish Association diversity is also a disadvantage, since the immigrants coming to Denmark show no respect to Danish society and Danish Culture. Thus, the Danish Association supports the motto of Denmark for Danes, and the common

denominator of Danish society is defined as Christianity. Further, one of the respondents asserted that non-European cultures cannot develop ‘we’ feeling as the natives do (DA):

The common understanding of what a society is and the trust that a homogeneous population can build disappears if the society becomes multiethnic. Multiethnic societies lack social cohesion. Muslims in Denmark, for example, will never feel the same sense of belonging as the Danes do because they belong to another cultural circle -the Arab- and they have other traditions -the importance of family, tribe-like culture, etc.-. The culturally homogeneous societies are stronger than the multicultural ones.

When it comes to the aspects of immigrants’ adaptation, the respondents of the anti-diversity groups agreed that immigrants should adapt to the language of the respective country, the political system, religion and other aspects of cultural life. The first feature that was observed in the views of the anti-diversity groups is that immigrants should adapt to the host society, or they should leave in the case they do not: this was observed in the views of MA, FN and BNA. As a second feature, nonetheless, they also conceive that non-European immigrants – especially Muslims- cannot adapt since they are coming from other cultures. Thirdly, in addition to ‘adapt, or leave’ discourse, what is suggested by the anti-diversity groups is that immigrants should not disturb the native society. To the extent that they do not insist on bringing their own values and cultural practices into public spaces, they should not, necessarily change their religion, thus their existence could be tolerated. Fourthly, hence, they should be adapting to daily practices of society.

The following depicts several examples of how the respondents from the anti-diversity groups recited the aforementioned features. First, ‘adapt, or leave’ discourse is recited by BNA and FN.

The state must buy a ticket for the members of the ethno-national minorities who do not want to adapt themselves. The ticket must be bought by a part of the salary that they receive. The state must show them the door. The state must send them back in this place where they want to live according to their rules and where they were born (respondent from BNA). .

There must be a clearer position: either you adapt, or you go somewhere else, or you stay at the borders of society without complaining (Respondent from FN).

Secondly, anti-diversity groups agreed that non-European culture is incommensurable to Europe culture, so that they can never adapt. The following answer from the BNA illustrates this:

The immigrants never can adapt themselves, because most of them are people having different cultural and traditional values, and views. The integration of such people in the society is relative. They must be helped to be adapted in some degree in the society, but yet they are guests and they must observe our laws and our rules. This is the most important thing.

Third feature, ‘they do not have to change their religion, but not to disturb the host society’ was mentioned by the members of BNA and MA.

They must observe the law and they must learn and speak the language. It is not necessary they to change their religion and culture, but they should not disturb the Bulgarian state, the Bulgarian society and the Bulgarian nation in any way (respondent from BNA).

The Chinese minority in Sofia a few months ago wanted a terrain for a Chinese quarter to be given to them. The Chinese people working at the bazaar Iliazi do not disturb me. But when they pretend to a quarter in Sofia, it does disturb me. If they want a quarter, let them go in Shanghai (respondent from BNA).

Immigrants should need to adapt themselves in terms of the noise pollution, and tidiness (respondent from MA).

Fourth feature of the anti-diversity discourse, concerning adaptation implies ‘adapting to the daily practices and cultural codes of the society’. This was mentioned by (MA_161; FN_563). These entail the appropriate behaviour in public space and public institutions, attitudes towards waste disposal and keeping the noise level low.

There are no St. Nicholas parties in Austrian kindergarten anymore. [...] But, we are the Occident and we have Christian roots. Pork isn’t offered in kindergarten anymore (respondent from MA).

It's his duty to adapt to rules of Christian religion in society: in Italy you can't consider equally Christmas or Mohammed's birthday, we need collective reference points to unite a people around a common feeling (respondent from FN).

I just read a report, stating that migrant juveniles did not bin their waste but threw it on the ground in a park in the 20th district, saying that this would be part of their culture, it had to be like that. He should participate in road traffic just like we are used to. If I go into a hospital today, and an immigrant is sick, at least 10 people are visiting him and are celebrating there

[...] they are eating on the floor, they take a seat on the neighbour's bed [...] that's not okay
(respondent from MA).

The last view is also shared by one of the respondents from the anti-racists (Respondent from ENAR_Fin):

“When we talk about political situation and law, I think, if you think about the immigrants, they are more relaxed people regarding law. Finns are very law abiding, very strict rules, and very strict regulations. They [the immigrants] are not used to it. Like having everything very clear, [e.g.] tax report. If I have a business like this, I have to tell how much I sell, for example, how much tax I get, how much tax I have to pay, what is the salary. - - salaries have to be clear. Not like you get cash and that's it. A lot of rules with the driving, with the parking... A lot of foreigners find it very frustrating to follow these rules because they are not used to it”.

As mentioned by Zizek (2010), the discursive patterns of ‘adapt or leave’, the incommensurability of Muslim immigrants, and the natives’ right not to be disturbed by the immigrants appear as these aspects on the adaptation of immigrants to host society. Further, one of the exclusionary aspects of the anti-diversity discourse is that it regards the immigrants as guests; thus they should have rights, instead of having rights: “Immigrants must have same obligations, not rights’, because they are immigrants. The immigrants must have the same obligations, not rights, as the native ethno-national minorities. The immigrants cannot have the same rights as the native people, because they are guests and they must observe the way of life and the culture of the hosting nation (respondent from BNA)”. On the other hand, a member of the FN resembles the immigrants to invaders and makes a distinction between a guest and an invader: “the difference between a guest and invader is that the guest respects your house, goods, wife and children (Gozzoli, FN)”. However, a respondent from Danish Association claims that immigrants can have equal rights.

5.2 State's role in immigrants' resistance to adaptation:

Some of the respondents from anti-diversity groups underlined the role of the state as to exile the immigrants that are not willing to adapt. The idea of expulsion was suggested by MA and BNA.

The state has the duty to say: if he does not want to live here, he can leave, it's up to him
(respondent from MA)

The state must buy a ticket for the members of the ethno-national minorities who do not want to adapt themselves. The ticket must be bought by a part of the salary that they receive. The state must show them the door. The state must send them back in this place where they want to live according to their rules and where they were born (respondent from BNA).

Anti-diversity groups agree that public institutions should not be adapted to meet the requirements of ethno-national minorities, whereas a few supported the idea that public institutions should be made multi-lingual in order to communicate with all minorities.

Anti-diversity groups, further, underlined the incommensurability aspect of non-Europeans, particularly the Muslim immigrants. The members of Danish association in the interviews asserted that people of Islamic countries have different conception of the social norms and relationships between the genders. MA, on the other, hand was established particularly to ban construction of a Mosque and the visibility of Islam in social life. They also claim that Muslim immigrants create parallel structures, and they try to enact their life-style into law.

One of the common features of the anti-diversity groups is that they have populist tendencies. They appeal to the people; thus, they do not address the political institutions (besides they perceive that they get public support for their claims). This populist approach was enunciated by the Moshee Ade respondent that diversity leads the natives to be discriminated (MA); “native Austrians are discriminated and their voices are not heard”.

The more interesting finding is that the anti-diversity groups dominantly claim that their views correspond to the public opinion, and they get support from the public when they declare their thoughts. Furthermore, they also feel that their views get support from the public. One respondent from MA suggest that “... [our] views get rather support, also from other parties’ politicians. They just don’t voice them publicly”.

The views of the civil society actors are pertinent with the public sphere research in the sense these views could foster public deliberation and exert communicative power, thus translating the discourses to public policies and laws. Parallel to this, Fekete (2006) argues that far-right discourse has had impact on the contemporary migration policies in Europe. Chambers and Kopstein (2001) also points out that the discourses of the ‘uncivil society’ can infiltrate into the mainstream discourse. In this report, we narrowed our focus with the discourses of anti-diversity groups; however, a further analysis can trace the imprints of these ideas within the mainstream groups and even in the public opinions.

6 Anti-racist groups and diversity

Respondents from the anti-racist organizations advocate that diversity is an advantage, since it creates a more dynamic society and a society with less rigid identity ascriptions. However, some of the disadvantages of diverse society were addressed. For example, one of the respondent from BNC asserted that diverse society leads to a cosmopolitan society, however the respondent also added that it could also lead to parallel societies: that is ethnic groups can impose their beliefs, thus restricting individual autonomy. Further, another respondent from the same organization thinks that immigrant communities could foster homophobia due to their patriarchal culture.

Contrary to ethno-national focus of the anti-diversity groups, anti-racist groups included almost each group in society within the definition of diversity, including gender, immigrant identities, sexuality, religious, ethnic groups. Further, in contrast to the protectionist immigration policies that are favoured by anti-diversity organizations, anti-racists organizations dominantly believe that no restrictions should apply for immigration.

Anti-racist groups support having multilingual hospitals, schools, and all other public bodies and multi-cultural education for public service functionaries. Concerning the adaptation of the immigrants, anti-racist groups mainly advocate the idea that immigrants should learn the language of the host society, and adapt to the political system. In the meantime, there are different views that have been voiced by the anti-groups: such as adaptation to the secularization (BNC; FASTI), and adaptation to way of host country's living (ENAR_Fin). On the other hand, some critical opinions about the adaptation were voiced: for instance, while one respondent regarded adaptation as a two way process in which the new comers and the host society adapt each other (EA), respondents from the No Borders was sceptical about the existence of a national life.

I'd like to challenge the British economic system myself. I don't believe in the law in the way we've got it. I think that the whole gap between British - Non British is problematic. This whole project is based on a set of concepts that I find inherently problematic: rule of law, states, nations... that are all a nightmare as far as I am concerned, and we need to move beyond them or at least push a bit their boundaries, find ways of living collectively that do not necessarily involve clashing (respondent from NB).

Moreover, compared with the anti-diversity respondents, the respondents from the anti-racist organizations believe that the views that they voiced and defended do not, or partly, correspond

to the general public opinion. The respondent from ENAR enunciates the relevant situation in Finland as follows:

Different. I receive a lot of negative atmosphere, there is xenophobia in the Finnish society. - - I think xenophobia is a word that means afraid of differences...different cultures. Because we could see even with the flow of immigrants coming here, people are worried, like what they are going to do. It's not about jobs - - but [they are] worried about everything else, social problems. Because they don't know them they are afraid [of]. So the atmosphere, the feeling is rather suspicious, worried, scared, so it's rather negative.

The same respondent from ENAR Finland also adds that he could get public support when he states his thoughts: “I get support, I think, yes. Like for example, I am from a Muslim religion and I even can change peoples mind about Islam. I can convince people about Islam being a romantic religion and I can get a lot of support”. The latter quote shows how public deliberation could change settled attitudes, enabling empathy between two interlocutors (in the case the immigrant and the native majority). As Arendt would put it, deliberation would also lead to “enlarged mentality”, thus breaking the fears about the unknown other. The anti immigrant popular right party in Finland, True Fins, on the other hand, increased its support to almost twenty percent despite this promise of public deliberation and exchange of ideas in creating a liberal and tolerant society.

The change on the public discourse on immigrants was also addressed by the French anti-racist group FASTI: “A positive discourse on migration was something normal, but since few years with the rights wing development, this discourse doesn’t work anymore. Nowadays we have much more in a regulatory perspective, with more control and culpability of persons”

6.1 Anti-racist groups, public sphere, and political rights

Some anti-racist organizations defended that the minorities should not have right to have political institutions (FASTI, BNC and REDI). Different options were also presented by the respondents; such as “they should have the right to actively integrate/participate within the (common) spaces where decisions are taken”, as suggested by a respondent from REDI. The problem, to this respondent, is the lack of substantive participation channels”. A respondent from TDG also mentioned that national and ethnic minorities should be integrated into the political system and decision-making processes by opening up dialogue with other parts of society and avoiding segregation

The selected anti-racist organizations' relation between, public opinion and media is different than anti-diversity groups. Despite anti-diversity groups conceive of themselves as reflecting the general public view, while the anti-racists consider their voice as marginal. Besides, anti-racists also see anti-diversity groups as the dominant voice in the society. Anti-diversity groups, further, complain about the fact that media show them as extremists; the anti-racists groups do not complain about the way they are portrayed at media.

However, it can be argued that they refer to a different ontology of public. To make it clear, the anti-diversity groups endeavour to consolidate an imagined fixed ontology of ethnicities, i.e. the case suggested by ethno-pluralism. In this case, public deliberation would not enable changing identities, since identities are conceived as static. In such context, further, the pure 'people' is entitled to draw the boundaries of participation in public debate. As it is shown, non-European culture was shown incommensurable and non-assimilative to host society. Anti-racists, however, strive for the very recognition claims of the minorities.

7. European Integration and national civil society actors

7.1 Anti-diversity and EU integration

Regarding the future development of the EU polity, most of the respondents from the anti-diversity groups that are examined in this report claim more autonomy for the member states. Preservation of national culture and national sovereignty emerges as the two main reasons of which most of the respondents from anti-diversity groups demand more autonomy for the nation-states. The statement of one respondent from BNA illustrates Euroscepticism and how cultural concerns are enunciated:

EU polity in the future should develop to more autonomy for the member states to be preserved the cultural diversity of the nations. If EU becomes a centralized state, the nations gradually will lose their cultural identity. I think that the propaganda of the European institutions is hypocritical that the diversity is the key to all, but in fact the European institutions destroy the diversity, because they want to create one nation, one state, not to exist the nationalities Bulgarian or German or French, but one to be European citizen, almost citizen of the world.

This respondent is against the notion of European citizenship by claiming that it is a homogenization project. Based on an essentialist approach, the respondent's alternative is ethno-pluralism which would preserve the national cultures. This essentialist oriented approach is defended also by the respondents from FN. However, the respondents from FN were more

positive for Europeanization, in the case that it would develop a more authoritarian polity based on common culture. While one of the two respondents from FN demanded to have a patriotic government such as Putin's, the other FN declared to base the commonality on the grounds of Roman and Christian culture.

It should start making politics and not making bureaucracy, it should take the trouble to create common humus and to be a supranational government of a community with common roots and ground layer in the Roman and Christian tradition.

The interview data also allowed us to observe the changing attitudes of the respondents from the anti-diversity groups towards the EU. One of the interviewee from the DA has been against the EC (EU); however, as he states, "the world has changed and he is now in favour of the Lisbon Treaty". To the respondent, the Treaty makes it impossible for the EU to impose rules on the nation states. One of the contradicting attitudes about European integration was presented by one of the respondents from BNA. On the one hand the respondent is against the EU for the interest of his/her own country. However, on the other hand, the respondent believes that EU membership would bring economic prosperity to other countries, such as Ukraine and Moldova.

The impact on EU integration on ethno-national diversity:

Anti-diversity groups expect that EU integration weaken the 'national culture', 'nation-state', and 'national identity'. Several negative impacts of EU integration were mentioned by the anti-diversity groups in terms of ethno-national diversity. The first negative impact, mentioned by one of the respondent from BNA, suggests EU destructs national culture. According to second negative impact, EU support encourages the ethnic-minorities to resent against the natives:

I observe some tendencies related to the artificial assistance of the EU to some ethnic minorities. The EU raises the self-confidence of some ethnic minorities for example in Bulgaria that will have negative reflections, because it leads to the discrimination of the Bulgarian ethnic group and hence to the conflicts between the ethnic groups. Some ethnic groups feel more privileged because of their ethnic belonging or they feel devoted (respondent from BNA).

The state must not give any rights to the different ethnic groups. It does harm. The state must forbid the international organizations to help some ethnic groups, because this help creates in these ethnic groups the feeling of impunity and they starts breaking the laws in the state and the norms in the society and this creates ethnic tension (respondent from BNA).

Further, anti-diversity groups dominantly suggests that the EU should not have any power to grant rights to minorities that cannot be revised by the Member States

7.2 Anti-racism and EU integration

Anti-racists organizations share an understanding that they would not support EU, unless it would enhance the conditions of minorities. Otherwise, they proved to be Eurosceptic; however, their arguments are different than the anti-diversity groups. The leftist oriented groups, such as FASTI, NB and EA, conceive of the European Union as a capitalistic project undermining the social dimensions and rights. However, when it comes to the impact of European integration on the rights of minorities, anti-racists mostly suggest EU power would be necessary. In this respect, they find the EU institutions relevant for their work, and in turn address them.

It should, however, be noted that generalizations could be misleading. For instance, there can be different views between and within the organization about the EU. For instance, the members of Norwegian Anti Racist Center (ARS) favour different positions for the role of EU in free movement, asylum and immigration policies: such as, strengthening the role of EU, refusing to transferring any right to EU institutions and sharing competences between national supranational institutions. One of the respondents from ENAR Finland is closer to nationalist view, e. g. suggested by *DA*: the respondent declares that he/she is content with the current EU system, since it leaves sovereignty to national states. The respondent also thinks that EU integration could weaken the national isolation. *BNC* on the other hand institutionally supports the EU integration and less autonomy for the member states, while *REDI* favours a multilevel principle wherein problems are solved in the optimum level. As mentioned, *EA*, *FASTI* and *NB* are EU sceptics.

BNC gives a positive value towards the EU as a political decision-maker. Hence, it is in favour of a strengthened EU, and thus weakening of the nation-states. It suggests that decisions on free mobility, migration, political asylum and illegal migration “principally be taken at EU level”. Nonetheless, *BNC* members assert that EU actions should be less than restrictive than nation-states. Otherwise, common regulation would lead to the adoption of the worst solutions. *ARS*, on the other hand, focuses on Norway; hence it does not reveal a clear position about EU. The respondents are sceptical due to: weakening of national autonomy and the distance between EU and local level. For one of the respondent from *ENAR Finland* the current system

is good since the power is held by the nation states. *FMH* is critical of the current political structure of EU since it exploits labour force. *TGD* defends increased centralization.

As an example for the positive impact of the EU on minority rights, one of the respondents from BNC thinks that the institution of the Council of Europe and the European Court of Human Rights are more adequate instruments, allowing also prosecuting a claim for individuals while the EU law only is valid in areas of European policy. Respondent also thinks that EU already does something in this area, also concerning lesbians and homosexuals and seems to assess that as positive. Furthermore, the national minorities can follow the EU politics since some of the native minorities' language has become one of the official languages in the EU – i.e. the Hungarians living in Austria, Slovenia, and Romania.

8. European public sphere and national civil society actors

8.1 Anti-diversity and EPS

The respondents from the anti-diversity groups agreed on the perception that there is not a European public space today, while some favour that communicative enclaves exist, including a common European Commission space of experts, political parties, and a space of social movements. One of the respondents from the anti-diversity groups claimed that state must know what is happening during communication (BNA), while conceiving of the nation states as the structural basis of communication (BNA). Argued in this way, nonetheless, this approach abandons the very essence of public sphere, free communication. The second view suggests that communication should be less centred and passed more through corporate bodies of corporations of labour markets and small ethnic communities (FN). The third argument regards that the national public debate is to some extent Europeanized – a parallel argument to Koopmans (2004) horizontal Europeanization (DA).

The national public debate is to some extent Europeanized Europe has changed a lot during the last 40 years and the national debate is very influenced by Europe and the need to think in European terms also around national issues. This is necessary because we are a member of the EU and the national parliament needs to include the EU for example in terms of harmonising legislation.

Some of the respondents from the anti-diversity groups suggest that an elite public sphere excludes normal citizens, and richer ones exclude socially disadvantaged ones. Respondents

from BNA related the situation of being excluded to ‘free communication, legal controls, and censorship’ in public communication (BNA).

There is not any free communication space in the world. Everyone can express his/ her opinion, but to the extent that his/her statement does not contradict to the norms and to the taboos in the EU (respondent from BNA).

I am against any legislation that can regulate or control expression of ideas and thoughts in Internet (respondent from BNA).

Positioned against capitalism, another view suggested that communication has been so much under the influence of economy; thus economy has been controlling the politics and political principles. This approach, therefore, suggests politicizing the communication (FN). This view, politicizing the communication reminds Habermas’ view. Nonetheless, the great difference is that Habermas has developed its ideas within the scope of a liberal and free society project. However, the proposal of the FN is grounded on authoritarianism.

Majority of the respondents from anti-diversity groups enunciated their willingness of further possibilities of trans-European communication, but some of them declared their reluctance to participate in trans-European communication and collaboration.

Anti-diversity groups mainly address the citizens in general; they do not target the political institutions including the national parliament, and the EU institution. It can be argued that this situation is compatible with their populist character; and this shows that they do not formally link (or do want to formally link with the strong publics -neither through the parties, nor the parliaments). To reiterate, the Habermasian notion of communicative power requires that the discourses of civil society foster public deliberation; and, the final end of this communication is to have impact on the public policies. Yet, the anti-diversity groups which are examined here follow a strategy of acting external to parliament and the political institutions. Ruzza (2009) asserts that this strategy is preferred by society when politics start losing legitimacy; hence, societal actors endeavour to mobilize public awareness external to political system. Moreover, it is also seen that anti-diversity groups, such as *BNA* and *FN*, are also engaging in organizing social activities, as Putnam and Tocqueville would put it, e.g. sports tournaments. In such a condition, trust could emerge between the participants along with a feeling of belonging. Drawing the danger of dispersing trust through participating in the very activities and ‘communication’ of the uncivil society Chambers and Kopstein (2001), then, argues that, in such a context, ‘apathy’ would be better option than politicization of the

individuals. For example, *BNA*¹⁰ and *FN* are members of European National Front; further research might examine whether this interaction has an impact on the views of these groups, considering the socialization thesis of the constructivists on the values of the actors (Esmark 2007).

8.2 Anti-racism and EPS

Anti-racists groups consider that there is a common European communication space of social movements. While some suggest that there is not a common European communication space, other considers the existence of the common communication space between experts and political parties. This is parallel answer with the anti-diversity groups.

One of the respondents from *ARS* thinks that ‘European public sphere is a good thing’; because it allows opinion-making mobilization transnationally in order to put pressure on the European political and judicial authorities. The same respondent further believes that *ARS* needs such networks to solve issues that cannot be solved at national level. *ARS* thinks that European lobby groups are not representative. *ARS* is in dialogue with organizations from the Czech Republic, Lithuania and Poland in order to provide a forum for dialogue and advice when applying funds from the European Economic Association.

ENAR Finland thinks that communication channels within European should be enhanced. According to one of the respondent, EPS should exist both at national and European level; hence, ‘Europeanism has to be brought closer to the EU’s citizenry. One of the members of the No Borders thinks that “UK is not as good as other European countries in connecting with other activists in Europe”’.

Anti-racists dominantly argue that an elite public sphere exist which exclude the normal citizens. While some of the respondents argue that a public sphere of richer ones exclude the disadvantaged ones, some other claim a male public sphere excludes the women. In sum respondents agreed on existence of a EPS in terms of European elites:

I don't know if e.g. Roma and Sinte people have a European representation [...] but I can imagine that this is not the case [...]. It is a fact and this is also a point of criticism regarding the EU that there exists a Europe of elites. Those who are well educated, who travel a lot get more out of it (respondent from BNC).

¹⁰ BNA is a member of the trans-European network United Front for National Resistance. It is often accused to be a pro-fascist organization, because of the using of Nazi-symbols. Moreover, it has maintained close relationships with some neo-Nazi European parties and especially with the European National Front - an international network of several neo-fascist political parties: Spanish La Falange; Deutsches Kolleg; German NPD (national-Democratic party); German Freier Widerstand Belgian Vlaams Blok; French Garde Franque; Rumanian Noua Dreapta ; Dutch Nationale Alliantie.

Contradicting with the Commission's claim that the apathy of the people to the EU, and EU policies stem from the lack of knowledge, one respondent underlined that for their organization it has become difficult to participate in EPS due to too much information.

Well, I think the problem is rather that it becomes a problem of too many resources. I think slowly it becomes difficult to get an overview and constantly contribute and participate. I think many people are overcharged because there is too much information (respondent from BNC).

Further, one of the respondents from REDI mentioned that public sphere is occupied with mainstream political parties.

For now I don't see a European space where common people, common citizens have a say and are taken into account. That's very far away; one watches the news and only sees deputies, relevant political groups, nothing more! One reads the press and watches television and only sees PSOE and PP, sometimes IU is given a few minutes on neighbour board, but 90 or 95% of what is said in the country is said by the two majority groups and that's it... those sectors that don't have the means to express themselves are discriminated, gypsies, homosexuals, women, gypsies, immigrants, vulnerable sectors have very little access to media (respondent from REDI).

It is observed that most of the organizations collaborate with 'like-minded' organizations: anti-racist organizations which concentrate directly on the improvement of the socio-political status of the immigrants in the society collaborate with human rights organizations, relief organizations, organizations that help to asylum seekers (such as BNC and ARS). The leftist oriented anti-racist organizations, on the other hand, also collaborate with other leftist organizations that suggest an alternative globalism.

Let's see, Ecologists are alive. I mean, it has a con-federal structure, since we obviously have an internal coordination and so on, and then with what other people, organisations, say outside Ecologists we work with? Depends on where you're talking about? And then it depends on the field we're talking about, some bring many things together, others not so much; the Ecologistas en Accion every single field of action has to do with anti-capitalism, with anti-globalisation, against war too, against Iraq war, Afghanistan, and all the rest we tend to look for alliances. We usually work together with other left-wing spheres. We tried to avoid political groups, political parties- although we also have some strength in platforms where left-wing parties are also present- but then with other left-wing anti-capitalist field. And now-

for example- this last year we're trying to approach the feminist movement (respondent from EA).

Moreover, some of the organizations try to avoid contacting with political groups, such as in the case of EA and FASTI. EA, however, has a contact person in Brussels and a member of European Environmental Bureau. FASTI was invited to the meetings with Ministry for Integration and National Identity; however, it rejected to participate since it does not recognize this ministry legitimate. Rather, it addresses to people. ENAR Finland addresses the Commission and the Parliament.

9 Concluding remarks

In sum, this report primarily contributes to the state-of-the-art with its empirical results that challenge the traditional theories of (European) public spheres by focusing on the role of 'uncivil society' in public deliberations. Our research is based on a qualitative study which examined the interview data, country reports, and the dataset, which entails the features of the NGOs and Social Movement Organizations examined by EUROSPHERE.

Theoretically, our task group is inspired from three sources: 1) normative studies on the pertinence between public deliberation and public sphere (Habermas 1996, Bebbhabib 1996); 2) the studies on the notion of uncivil society (Chambers and Ruzza 2001; Ruzza 2009); and far right (Rygden 2007). Following Chambers and Kopstein (2001) and Ruzza (2009), we defined the far right anti-immigrant national societal organizations as anti-diversity groups. In this respect, we concentrated on anti-diversity groups in four European countries, and compared them with the anti-racist civic organizations. This focus contradicts with the claim that civil society organizations foster democratic public deliberation, and in turn contribute to the nourishing of democratic citizens. The focus of WP5.3, rather, reveals that some of the organizations may foster exclusionary (and sometimes hatred) claims. The report, then, substantiates the patterns of exclusion which are translated into public deliberation, and questions the very construction of the public itself. In this context, the comparison of anti-diversity groups with the anti-racists enables to depict repertoire of exclusionary (and to great extent conflicting) discourses which articulate into public debate within Europe.

References

- Chambers, S. and Kopstei, J. (2001), "Bad civil society", *Political Theory*, Vol:29, No: 6, pp. 837-865.
- Donatella Della Porta and Manuela Caiani, *Social Movements and Europeanization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Della Porta, D and Diani, M. (2006). *Social movements: An introduction* (2nd revised edition). Malden Mass.: Blackwell Publ.
- Della Porta, D. (2005a). "The Europeanization of Protest: a Typology and some Empirical Evidence". In: Gianfranco Bettin Lattes & Ettore Recchi (Eds.): *Comparing European Societies. Towards a Sociology of the EU*. Bologna: Monduzzi. pp. 261–286.
- Della Porta, D. (2005b). "Multiple Belongings, Tolerant Identities, and the Construction of "Another Politics": Between the European Social Forum and the Local Social Fora". In: Donatella Della Porta & Sidney G. Tarrow (Eds.): *Transnational protest and global activism*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Doerr, N. and Haugh, C. (2006). "Public Spheres within Movements: Linking Transnational Social Movements Research and the (Re)search for a European Public Sphere". Paper prepared for the international colloquium "Crossing Borders: On the road toward transnational social movement analysis" held 5-7 October 2006 at the Social Science Research Center Berlin.
- Feree, M. M., W. A. Gamson, J. Gerhards and D. Rucht (2002), "Four models of the Public Sphere in modern democracies", *Theory and Society*, 31, 289-324.
- Imig, Doug and Sidney Tarrow (2001) "Mapping the Europeanization of Contention: Evidence from a Quantitative Data Analysis", in Imig, Doug and Tarrow, Sidney (eds) *Contentious Europeans: Protest and Politics in and Emerging Polity*, pp. 27-52.
- Imig, Douglas R. & Tarrow, Sidney G. (Eds.) (2001): *Contentious Europeans: protest and politics in an emerging polity*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman Littlefield.
- Imig, D., Tarrow, S. (1999): The Europeanisation of Movements? A New Approach to
- Kochler-Koch, B., B. Finke (2007), "The Institutional Shaping of EU-Society Relations: A Contribution to Democracy via Participation?", *Journal of Civil of Civil Society*, 3(3):205- 221.
- Koopmans, R. and Erbe, J. (2004). "Towards a European public sphere? Vertical and horizontal dimensions of Europeanized political communication". *Innovation*, Vol. 17, No. 2, pp. 97–118.
- Kohler-Koch, B. (2009), "The three worlds of European civil society—What role for civil society for what kind of Europe?", *Policy and Society, Volume 28, Issue 1, April 2009*, pp. 47-57.
- Olesen, T. (2005). "Transnational Publics: New Spaces of Social Movement Activism and the Problem of Global Long-Sightedness". *Current Sociology*, Vol. 53, No. 3, pp. 419–440.
- Greenwood, J.(2007a), *Interest Representation in the European Union*, Palgrave:Macmillan.
- Greenwood,J. (2007b), 'Review Article: Organized Civil Society and Democratic Legitimacy in the European Union', *B. J. of Political Science*, 37, 333-357.
- Keck, M and K. Sikkink (1998), *Activists beyond borders*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

- Kohler-Koch, B. (2009), “The three worlds of European civil society—What role for civil society for what kind of Europe?”, *Policy and Society, Volume 28, Issue 1, April 2009*, pp. 47-57.
- Ruzza, C. (2009), “Populism and Euroscepticism: Towards a Uncivil Society”, *Policy and Society*, Vol:28, No:1, pp. 87-98.
- Rydgren, J. (2007), “*Sociology of Radical Right*”, *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol:33, pp.241-262.
- Steffek, J, Kissling C. and Nanz, P. (2007), “Civil Society Participation in European and Global Governance: A Cure for the Democratic Deficit”, Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Trenz and Eder, K. (2004), ‘The Democratizing dynamics of a European Public Sphere: Towards a Theory of Democratic Functionalism’, *European Journal of Social Theory*, 7(1), pp. 5-25.
- Zimmel, A. and M., Freise, (2006), “Brining Society Back in: civil society, social capital, and third sector”, NEZ, Munster. http://nez.uni-muenster.de/download/CONNEX_22.feb.pdf.

ANNEX 1

Summary of the Comparative Analyses Between Xenophobic and Anti-Racist Groups

Variable	Anti-diversity groups MA, BNA, DA, FN	Anti-racist groups ARS, ENAR, FMN, NB, TG, REDI, FASTI, EA, EoG,
Diversity definition	National belonging and ethnic groups Anti-diversity groups do not exclude the gender from their perception of diversity, but they also foster homophobia – homosexuality something to be fight for, and anti-Semitism. Islam is the absolute other. FN celebrates the plurality of society, referring back to the Roman Empire BNA considers each who contributes something in society.	Almost each group is considered within the definition of diversity. Gender. Immigrant, sexuality, religious, ethnic groups hold more than the others.
Groups' claims	Groups claims should not be given priority, not a single respondent mentions that the all groups' claims should be given equal priority:	Anti-racist on the other hand, believes groups claims should be given equal priority.
Diversity as an advantage	Equally distributed answers whether the diversity is an advantage: avoid a homogenising social cohesion; a more dynamic society; create a society with less rigid identity ascriptions; achieve an economically more successful society; create a more just society; cultural aspects Advantage when it is limited with national minorities.	a more dynamic society; a society with less rigid identity ascriptions
Diversity as a disadvantage	Makes it difficult to achieve political unity. The paradox here is that, on the one hand, they suggest diversity is an advantage to avoid a homogenising social cohesion. On the other hand, they see it as a disadvantage to achieve political unity. It excludes the natives.	Diversity is not a disadvantage for society

Public institutions adapted to meet the requirements	They argue dominantly that public institutions should not be adapted to meet the requirements of ethno-national minorities	They support to have multilingual hospitals, schools, and all other public bodies; and multi-cultural education for public service functionaries.
Immigrants should adapt	immigrant should adapt to the political system and language of the respective country. Immigrants should adapt themselves in terms tidiness, and noise pollution (MA). Immigrants – Muslims- cannot integrate, because they are coming from another culture. It is not necessary to for them to change their religion, and culture, they should not disturb the Bulgarian state, Bulgarian society, and the Bulgarian nation (BNA). They should adapt to way of living (MA) Adapt or leave (FN and BNA).	Immigrant should adapt to the political system and language of the respective country. Secularization (BNC; FASTI). It is a two way process (EA) They should adapt to way of living (ENAR Fin). Sceptical about the existence of an existence of a national life (NB)
State's role in immigrants' resistance to adaptation	State should intervene in all minority cultural practices that do not conform to or that weaken the values and culture of this society	State should intervene in minority cultural practices in the cases when they restrict individual liberty.
Correspondence with the dominant public opinion	Corresponds to the public opinion	Either partly corresponds, or does not correspond with the public opinion
Getting support from the public for its opinions	They are confident that their views correspond with the public opinion.	None.

development of the EU polity	Autonomy for the member states/dominantly Though BNA is against EU integration, the respondent mentions about the economic benefits of EU that it could bring Ukraine and Moldova.	Further integration, less autonomy for the member states (BNC). EU sceptics are the EA, FASTI, NB, whereas REDI is favours a multilevel polity. The argument is that the antidote of the nation-state is not necessarily the EU governance.
the impact of the EU integration on the diversity	Weakening the national culture There is an exclusionary European identity: having the same ethnical origin (MA). Minorities has to be graded by integrating to the point they stop to be a minority (MA).	Strengthening, but also weakening the diversity EU integration has mostly have positive impacts on EU (ENAR_Fin472). EU integration is weakening the national isolation and this is a good thing. National minorities can follow the EU integration, since their language is an official language in EU (for instance Hungarians living in Austria, Slovenia, Romania (BNC).
impact on the gender	Relates gender as a European value.	
EU's power to grant minority rightst	EU should have not any power to grant rights to minorities. Islam is the absolute other, see the FN: There are deeply respectable cultures and traditions , like the African or Indian ones, and they are equal to the European culture, whereas islamisation is different and then we make a big confusion with some tribal deviations which aren't in the Koran, such as infibulation, but it's not a danger in my opinion	All groups
Which group of immigrants should be let into the country	Highly educated, and some of the respondents suggest to restrict the further immigration. There is not a clear reaction to Muslim immigration (MA; BNA).	Dominantly, no restrictions should apply (BNC, NB). Immigration should regulate itself (BNC). Immigrants with English skills (ENAR_Fin).
The reasons for not accepting a country member of the EU	unchristian countries, Turkey	Human right is mostly mentioned amongst the anti-racists.

Is there a EPS?	One common communication space does not exist. There is an common public sphere for experts Nation states are the structural basis of communication (BNA). National public debate is to some extent Europeanized (DA).	Dominantly, one common space for social movements; this view is followed by one communication space does not exist.
does EPS public sphere exclude?	There is not any free communication space in the world; everyone can express her opinion, but to the extent this does not contradict with the norms and taboos in the EU (BNA). Against the regulation or control of ideas and thoughts on internet (BNA). Communication should be directed via the member states (BNA); communication should be less centred but pass through intermediate social bodies of corporations in labour market, among small communities (FN).	It has become difficult to participate, because there is too much information (BNC) There exists of European elite (BNC). Public space is occupied by mainstream political parties (REDI).
Collaboration with other organizations?	Each is positive for the possibility of having more collaboration.	Leftist oriented anti-racist organization collaborates with other leftist oriented group for global protest (EA).
Membership in other networks?	BNA and FN collaborate under European National Front.	
The political actors addressed	Do not address the national parliaments; dominantly they just address the citizens. However, Moshee Ade addresses the political bodies, the Commission and the EP. They do not formally link to the strong publics, neither through the parties, nor the parliaments.	Dominantly the citizens, though few respondents claim to address the EU institutions. They mostly focus on the national institutions and the citizens. Some refuses to collaborate with the political institutions (FASTI).

