

SOUTH EUROPEAN INTEREST GROUPS AND THEIR INCLUSION IN THE EC.*

*Dusan Sidjanski***

Since their return to democratic pluralism, the three South European countries have become members of the EC; Greece in 1980 and Spain and Portugal in 1986 each drawing closer to the model of western democracies and to the principles of the EC. In accordance with the pluralism of its members the EC is characterised by the existence of various organizations and centres of decision. At the

* This synthesis report, submitted to the XIVth World Congress of International Political Science Association (28 August-1 September 1988), Washington D.C., reproduces the results of research on **the political parties and interest groups in their relations with European units and groups** performed under my direction with the aid of the Volkswagenwerk Foundation. It is based on the following papers submitted to the Conference on "The Integration of the Southern Europe to the European Community" organized by the Faculty of Political Science, University of Istanbul, 12-13 November 1987: Carlos GARCIA, **les groupes socio-professionnels espagnols et la Communauté**, University of Geneva, October 1987; Anna MELICH, **problématique centre-périphérie en Espagne: intégration à la CE des groupes dont le siège n'est pas dans la capitale**, University of Geneva, October 1987; Maximos ALIGAKIS, Ioannis PAPADOPULOS, with the collaboration of Marianna COSSINA, **aspects de l'insertion des groupes d'intérêts grecs dans la Communauté Européenne: la perception des élites en tant qu'indicateur d'intégration**, University of Geneva, October 1987; Guilhermina MARQUES, **quelques aspects de l'intégration des groupes d'intérêts portugais au niveau européen**, University of Geneva, March 1988; Ural AYBERK-Emre BODUROĞLU, **les groupes d'intérêt turcs face à la Communauté Européenne**, University of Geneva, October 1987.

** Professor of Political Science, Department of Political Sciences and Institute European Studies, University of Geneva.

political stage this pluralism is exemplified by the presence of various political parties and free elections, at the socio-economic stage it is symbolized by the diversity of groups which reflect a variety of activities, interests and values. Obviously, the EC has neither the solidity nor the socio-political structuring capacity of its member states yet. Nevertheless it carries, at least potentially, the basic marks of an emerging political community. In fact, its political nature is reflected by its structure which displays the principal forms of a democratic government. The motive force at the legislative or executive levels, which is conceived by the Commission-Council tandem and by the Council-European Parliament "cooperation" under assistance from the Economic and Social Committee and various other advisory organs, is put under the legal supervision of the Court of Justice and -through the Commission- the democratic supervision of the European Parliament. The European Community is based on firm ground simply by the nature of its conception: the creation of the European Council which brings together the highest ranking political authorities and the election of the European Parliament assuring its direct democratic foundation¹ and the growing influence of the European Parliament regarding budgetary and legislative matters.

This Community, endowed with powers of a political nature but limited in scope, essentially of economic content governs not only certain aspects of the behaviour of Member States but also groups and individuals. In fact, this emerging European authority presents an entirely original trend with its capacity to take decisions which affect groups, enterprises and people as well as the Member States. By influencing directly the actors of the socio-economic scene, the EC incites a vast movement of re-groupment of, in particular, the interests which have already been organized at the national level. As a consequence of this, it has formed a network consisting of interest groups, at the Community level, around the principal decision centres of the EC. Obviously, these European groups, about 500 of them, have neither the structure nor the capacity comparable to their national counterparts, but all the same, they are better organized and more efficient than the international organizations of the same nature. Their actions are more intensive and tangible, corresponding, in principle, to domains at which the EC takes decisions and formulates common

policies.² From a different angle, this European network of organizations, their structures as well as their governing organs' formation and their membership are, in fact, the indicators of the real power of the Community and the intensity by which the socio-economic integration has been achieved in the EC.

The coming into force of the European Single Act on the 1st of July 1987, has vigorously accelerated the activities at the Community level in which the interest groups have been actively involved. It is assumed that the interest groups have found their structures and functions strengthened by the idea of a Europe without internal frontiers as well as due to the developments in common policies and basic structural considerations.

The development of the European interest groups has been accomplished at the face of many problems regarding representation and protection of the achieved socio-economic level. This last variable has normally been effective much later than the problem of promotion. In general, when the project of unification has developed far enough to necessitate a new centre or a new echelon of administration or decision-making, the institutional power of the European Community has been manifest in the embodiment of groups of activity parallel to the national ones. Organization of groups at the European level is in response, to a great extent, to a necessity. If the EC finds it necessary to adopt a common policy pertaining to agriculture, it is not possible to think of keeping the farmers away from organizing to influence its formulation and to control its orientation.

After a first wave activated by the OEEC, a second wave has been set up by the energetic entrance of the CECA (1953): European professional organizations whose field of action was limited by Six in the relevant two sectors. The objectives and problems at the Community level were of a magnitude which was surpassing those at the level of OEEC with regards the parties involved, who were endowed in one way or the other with structures more solid.

However the institution of the organs of the EEC (1958) has created a new wave much larger in amplitude than the previous one. This new movement of professional organization at the Community

level was openly supported by the members of the Commission (in particular by S. Mansholt representing agricultural products and industries).

The development was slow until 1957: the CECA, limited by two sectors, has not been successful in creating more than about fifteen groups until the signing of the Treaty of Rome in March 1957. After that the growth was fast. 12 groups were created in 1957, then 46 in 1958 attaining a maximum of 71 in 1959. From that point onwards the curve turned down to 43 in 1960, 25 in 1961, 21 in 1962 and 18 in 1963. Between 1957 and 1963 the average growth was 34 groups annually reaching a total of 236; on the other hand, only 11 groups were created in 1964 and the average of 1964 to 1975 was not more than about 10 groups per year, totalling up to 105 for that period. The trend for the period 1975-1985 was similar, with an average nearing 10 and a total of 108.

This change in the rate of creation of groups is explained by the fact that the 241 groups which inhabited the Community before 1964 covered all the essential professional activities which was gradually completed with the institution of the extra 105 up to 1975. In the agricultural sector, the 24 groups established until 1967, were successful in responding to the needs of this sector which was less diversified regarding products and activities. On the other hand, the industry and services sectors continued to develop their network of professional organizations although at a more moderate rate.³

Inclusion of the South European groups of interest within the groups of the Community.

<u>Country</u>	<u>Integration</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1975</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>1986</u>
Greece	1980	-	2	66	154
Spain	1986	-	5	167	189
Portugal	1986	-	-	85	113
Total number of groups of interest in the Community		308	346	431	515

The Greek interest groups' integration proceeded rather slowly and in a manner not in conformity with the trend so far followed. If we compare this situation with the entry of Portuguese and Spanish groups of interest we can see that the latter countries' groups have established organic and substantial relations with those of the Community much earlier than their formal entry and much more intensely than their Greek counterparts. How to explain this inconsistency? Are the Greek groups insufficiently disposed regarding necessary personnel or means for representation at the European level? Do the cost, the distance or the language form barriers in the way of their participation in the activities of the European groups? On the other hand, are the Greek groups simply less in number, less well structured or more inward bound compared to the groups of the other two South European countries?

The groups of the new members of the European Community follow, more or less, the same route that the groups of the founding countries have followed: the groups which are most interested in and most motivated by the European Community establish relations first with the groups of interest at the Community level and others gradually follow depending on how well they feel their interests are represented. This process takes a relatively long period of time, somewhere about five years to reach a sufficient level of representation. For example, the agricultural groups of interest of the Community, on account of the formulation of a common agricultural policy have established organic relations first. The industrial sector and the services attract the recently adhering groups to the EEC according to their sectors and type of interest. In the case of Greek and Portuguese interest groups, following the agricultural groups it was mainly the liberal vocational groups and trade unions which sought representation at the European level. Recently some non-Community member countries (e.g. Switzerland, Austria, Nordic countries) frequently participate in the activities of the Community groups.

Concerning the Turkish interest groups, one can observe a certain hesitation on the side of the Community groups of interest. At the time being, four Turkish groups are members of the Community groups. They take part at the Permanent Conference of the Chambers of Commerce and Industry of the EEC, The European Confederation of

Trade Unions and The Committee of Professional Agricultural Organizations of the EEC. The Turkish Confederation of Employers which was member of the UNICE, to resign later on account of conflicts regarding assignment of quotas, has recently been re-integrated following Turkey's demand for entry into the EC.⁴

The main comparison of the interest groups of South Europe is not easy on account of differences that exist between the three countries in question, although they are situated in a part of Europe which is more or less homogeneous in many respects. Regarding their histories, their traditions of cooperation, the evolution of the interest groups are different and also the legal frameworks and socio-economic environments vary considerably from one country to the other. In the meantime, these countries which belong to similar parts of Europe can also be associated with Ireland as a country with an economic level within the lower group in the EC.

According to the statistical data concerning the EC (European Parliament, *Les Progrès de la construction européenne*, 1987, p. 9) the per capita incomes were in 1985, roughly 2600 ECU's in Portugal, 4500 ECU's in Greece and 5500 ECU's in Spain. This difference becomes less vivid when purchasing parities (PP) are compared; the difference which is very small between Greece (about 7000 ECU's) and Portugal (about 6500 ECU's) is rather high in the case of Spain (about 9000 ECU's).

Taking into account all these differences, we find ourselves in a position to compare these interest groups between themselves and with the European groups with respect to three dimensions: the organizational and functional dimension; the decision-making dimension and the Community dimension.⁵

The *organizational dimension* of the South European interest groups depends on a multitude of factors mostly heterogeneous and dissimilar. These factors vary from country to country. Without dwelling too far on these factors one can pick up certain landmarks on which to base a coherent survey. The interest groups undertake complex but quite similar tasks. First of all, the organization defends

the interests of its members at points of decision-making. It is the centre of information facing inside as well as the outside. It represents its members; this final role taking priority in the Community context. The organization is in a way the spokesman for its members. It carries information from the EC to its members and the vice-versa, expressing the point of view of its members. In this respect a basic difference exists between the large central organizations and the small ones. The former has at its disposal considerable means as compared to the latter which possess very modest possibilities. The former ones have developed bureaucratic structures. Many people are employed on a full-or a part-time basis. They also use permanent experts and have means of obtaining reports from institutions or independent experts. Whereas in the latter sort of organization one can find very few permanent experts and in case they exist they are asked to assume a multitude of functions.

The degree of organization equally determines the capacity of influence but also the degree of representation. Its function gains in permanence and allows for a certain flexibility and continuity in response to its members' demands. The organizational structures are often designed for a certain functional structure. In cases where the bureaucratic structure can be made to absorb a multitude of complex tasks the organization gains in autonomy.

The *decision-making dimension* of the South European interest groups is the second aspect of our study. The decision-making mechanism is not an easy one to analyse due to the fact that there is not a single type of decision-making. Of the many types of decision-making one type is purely administrative and the others are of a political nature which involves the interest groups as such. How are the decisions made? By consensus, by a vote of majority or by a delegation of authority? The organizational dimension plays a decisive role in this matter. The consensus method is mostly practical. In certain cases voting is applied within the groups. According to our survey, it appears that the interest groups have generally a pragmatic approach. The responsables have many professional, representative and administrative tasks. They wear many hats. One can find the same people in many organizations. This factor requires particular attention for the determination of not only the inter-penetration of interest

groups but also their degree of autonomy, which is a key element in the decision-making mechanism.

Regarding the *Community dimension* the approach to matters pertaining to the Community in general of the interest groups of the South European countries is mainly governed by three factors. First of all their interest is the main factor which determines their behaviour. The groups belonging to sectors which are influenced the most by the European integration are the first to organize and establish contacts with the Community groups. The second factor has to do with their financial and administrative capacity. The large central organizations of the South European countries are the first to participate in the activities of the Community groups, as associate members in the beginning gradually becoming corresponding members and then full members. They are usually the employers' organizations acting in the fields of commerce, industry, agriculture and also in the capacity of employers' unions. The last factor is the advantage of obtaining first hand information from the EC without passing through the official channels. This priority in obtaining information is particularly important when the sector in which the group acts is involved in matters concerning the Community.

These three factors not only guided the formulation of our questionnaire but also influenced the orientation of our studies. It is also necessary to add a last factor, much studied, into this domain. Socialisation at the Community level which appears in the form of apprenticeship in general also plays a decisive role in determining the behaviour of the interest groups coming from the South of Europe when faced with questions concerning the Community. The groups of countries recently admitted to the EC require a certain time, longer or shorter depending on the group, for the interest group to gain first awareness of the interest groups at the Community level, then to display an interest in information concerning them, to establish contacts and finally after a period of observation some interest groups really begin to participate in the activities of the Community groups.

In this synthesis report, the comparisons dwell on the following aspects: 1. the role of the interest groups in transition to democracy; 2. their attitude towards the EC; 3. adaptation of the interest groups to and their participation in the activities of the Community groups; 4. the functions of national interest groups as related to the EC; 5. evaluation of the influence of the national interest groups at the Community level.

1. The interest groups and transition to democracy

Contrary to Spain and Portugal, Greece has suffered only one interruption in the democratic process after the War, between 1967 and 1974 under the colonels' regime. This interruption did not have major effects on the interest groups whose structures or management had in fact enjoyed a certain stability under the dictatorship which practised a liberal economic policy. The trade unions, on the other hand, which were already weak under the democracy suffered a further set back and marginalisation under the regime.

From the point of view of the interest groups, the return to democracy in 1974 did not bring any significant changes at the structural level, however it emphasized the autonomy of the organizations and caused changes at the management level. This continuity of structure and administrative style of the professional organizations is also one of the reasons for the rigidity of the Greek groups which, despite the long period elapsed since their application and acceptance, still require very little support from the Community groups to improve their standing at the national level. This may be one of the reasons which govern the slow progress of the process of adaptation of the Greek groups to the Community environment.

The evolution concerning the two Iberian countries has been quite different. Paradoxically, the socio-economic groups of these countries had not been acquainted with a development outside of that which prevails under a corporatist system. In fact, in that context, the political power had been seeking means of slowing down or controlling the progress towards autonomy of employer or labour groups, imposing on them vertical organizational systems. This State intervention had given rise to the development of underground or

parallel systems, especially the trade unions with Communist inclinations (the Portuguese *Intersyndicale* and the Spanish Workers' Commissions).⁶ The socio-economic structures, as they are today, had begun to emerge and to establish themselves progressively with the implementation of a gradual opening up and liberalization programme of the economies of these two countries: see the role of the OPUS DEI, of the sixties in Spain during which time the exceptional economic growth was accompanied by in-depth changes in the economic structure; also the liberalization policy implemented by the Caetano government during the years preceeding the Portuguese Revolution. This Revolution of 1974 has, in reality, caused a break much sharper than that which took place in Spain with the coronation of Juan Carlos I in 1975; from then onwards, despite a slight setback due to the revolutionary, unstable period between 1974 and 1976 in Portugal, both countries have taken decisive measures towards the democratization of their socio-political structures.

With the transition to democracy in Portugal, the trade unions came up from their clandestine positions. By 1976, the hegemony of the *Intersyndicale* had been overcome and the tertiary sector unions, supported by the SP and SDP had ended up victorious. A second central labour organization, UGT with socialist and social democratic leanings was established which stirred a dissident movement at the heart of the *Intersyndicale*. A similar chain of events took place in Spain after the enactment of the law recognizing the freedom of unionist activities in 1977, which allowed groups of trade unions to organize at the expense of the vertical unions of the old regime and to form two main branches, the UGT which was of socialist leaning and the Confederation of Unions of Worker Commissions which sympathized with the PCE.⁷

The employer organizations were rather slow and were established beginning from 1975, in reaction to the socializing policy of the pro-communist Portuguese government. Confederation of Portuguese Industry (CIP) was founded in 1975 and the Confederation of Portuguese Trade (CCP) in 1976. During negotiations with the IMF, they gained in influence due to the fact that the minority government of socialist Soares needed their support to be

able to come to terms with the IMF. On the other hand, following the launching of the agricultural reform and the nationalization in 1975, the Confederation of Portuguese Farmers (CAP) was established. Both the CIP and CAP supported the SP and the SDP to put an end to the revolutionary period. The three confederations met regularly in order to coordinate their activities in favour of a liberal economic policy which, in fact, corresponds to the EC's orientation.⁸ Their legitimacy and their influence have since been enhanced with the institution in 1983 of the Permanent Council for Social Cooperation and their affiliation to groups at the Community level.⁹ Also the attachment of Portuguese professional groups to the EC organs have reinforced their standing at the national level.

The Spanish employers' organizations have been formed and accepted following the enactment of the law of 1977. The Spanish Confederation of Employers' Organizations (CEOE) was founded in 1977 along with the other organizations of the CEPYME and the AEB. The National Confederation of Farmers and Breeders was also established at the same time.

At the beginning of the transition period, a certain confusion reigned concerning the respective roles of the political and socio-economic leaders, due in part to the fact that the new political personalities were, to a significant proportion, also the responsables of professional groups.¹⁰ The leaders of employers' and labour organizations also assumed leading political functions especially as a result of their representation at the Parliament during the first legislative periods of the new regime.¹¹ This situation changed following the signing of the "Pact of Moncloa" in 1977 and the coming into being of the principal parliamentary parties, from which members of unions and employer organizations have been excluded. After this division of responsibilities, the employers' and trade unions' leaders gradually began to make manifest their groups' desires to establish their autonomy with regards the State and the political parties. A desire for the pursuit of common views and interests both from the point of view of groups and of the political parties are no longer evident or necessary as it was during the beginning of the transition to democracy.

As compared to the other two countries of the South, Spain displays a peculiarity due to its autonomous regions like Catalonia.¹² Its status of autonomy gained in 1979 could suffer from entry into the EC, due to certain restrictions concerning the role assigned to the central government in activities at the Community level. Supporting the causes of integration and Europe of Regions, the Catalan authorities seek means of preserving and increasing their autonomy by applying measures necessary for abidance with the norms and execution of the decisions of the Community that are within their competence (art. 27 al 3 of the Status of Autonomy), and by supporting the actions of the regional groups. In 1982, the government established the "Patrona Catala, Pro Europa" to facilitate the integration of various sectors to the EC. By 1986 it has installed a Catalonian office in Brussels to serve the Catalan interests and also to provide a seat for the officials and private representatives of the region. Also the Catalan employers associations are in direct contact with Brussels. Sometimes, a regional association like the Catalan Confederation of Commerce, participates directly at the level of European Confederation of Retail Trade. This tendency towards regional representation gaining force by the presence of certain German "Länder" and certain regional interest groups is likely to become more widespread with the realization of a single market without frontiers, envisaged for 1993.

The foremost industrial region of Spain, the Catalonia accomodates 38 (20%) of the 189 national Spanish interest groups represented at the Community level. Another sign of the presence of the region is manifest in the predominant role it plays in the national interest groups. Examples are: The Spanish Intertextile Council created in 1980 in view of integration, which is a member of the **Comitextil**; The Spanish Association of the Mesh Industries member of **Mailleurop**. These organizations, most of the leaders of which are the former leaders of regional organizations, now have undertaken the representation of the national interests in Brussels.¹³

Not altogether in the same plan of comparison, the case of Turkey is studied in the double perspective of its process of democratisation and of its demand for integration into the EC. After many interruptions in the democratic process and three years of the military regime, Turkey has once again returned to the democratic road since 1983. In this new context, the interest groups, whose activities had been suspended during the military regime, have regained their functions following the parliamentary elections in 1983 and within the framework of the liberal economic policy of the Özal Government. The aim was the modernization of the economic structure by the introduction of the competitive market system and opening up of the economy to the outside, and particularly to the EC.¹⁴ Before that, the Turkish economy, since the establishment of the Republic was a protected economy, where the state enterprises which were created about fifty years ago for the promotion of industrialization, continued to occupy a central place. In fact, they employ more than a half of all the workers in the manufacturing industries and the state investments constitute 55% of the total of investments. In this situation, the definition and re-institution of the role of the State in the economy becomes a task of priority. In this sense, a series of measures have been taken to adapt the public enterprises to the laws of the market economy.¹⁵ Evaluating the attitudes of the principal Turkish interest groups in view of adaptation to a liberal economy and opening up to international competition, one obtains the impression that the process may be slow to proceed as the majority of these groups are in favour of taking a central position half-way between a liberal and a state-controlled economy. The most outstanding exception of this situation is the truly liberal position of the Textile Employers' Union and of MESS (Metal Industries Employers' Union). Textiles represent more than a third of all the exports of Turkey and the Union mentioned is the unique representative at the EC Commission. An important point is the centrist position of the principal workers' union Türk-İş which is in favour of the EC in its expectation of its influence on the stabilization of the democracy and attainment of a higher level of protection of the rights of workers.¹⁶ Opening themselves to competition and to the conditions of a market economy, the Turkish interest groups are preparing for participation in the Community activities.

2. The attitudes of the interes groups towards the EC

From the political point of view, the perception of the integration process of the Spanish socio-economic groups is, in general, positive. Both the employers' groups -the majority of which hold the positive view with none against- and the spokesmen for the unions consider Spain's entry into the EC a positive move and in support of the development of the democratic political system.

The views on the economic consequences, however, vary; the leaders of the employers' organizations express more optimistic views than those of the unions, the more optimistic ones being nearer to the government. On the other hand, the more pessimistic organizations are mostly sectoral ones or those farther away from the governmental front.¹⁷

A similar attitude is manifest among the Portuguese interest groups. With the exception of the groups in alliance with the PCP, most of the groups express views which converge towards a positive attitude in consensus that the EC would contribute to the stabilization of the democracy. This general positive attitude, was much more in emphasis at the period of negotiations with the EC, during which time the interest groups had been confronted with various substantial problems. Since then, the employers and their various sectors have expressed reservations and assumed a position enabling better protection of their interests. In the meantime, following the integration of Portugal, this circumspect attitude is transformed to a more positive attitude recognizing the reality of integration and the need for extracting from it as much advantage as possible.¹⁸

On the Greek side the principal political advantages of integration are the services rendered in support of the general interests of the country and its contribution to the institutional and juridistic modernization. Most of the representatives of the employers' organizations still dwell on its economic advantages and disadvantages. For certain groups like the Greek merchant marine, the integration brought neither gains nor losses. Of the many groups which appeared to fear the adverse effects of external competition,

especially on account of the more advanced technological level of some of the countries, now none pronounce a word against the EC. The farmers' organization PASEGES, which always stressed the danger of external competition, keeps a positive balance however this being mainly due to the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes, modernization of this sector and various aids.

On the side of the trade unions, despite the relatively favourable opinion of the General Confederation of Greek Workers (GSEE), their perception of the integration is in general less positive than the employers'. The trade unions which are nearer to the Communist Party or the left wing of PASOK carry still less favourable opinions. An example is the Athens Labour Exchange which is controlled by the Communist Party.

Altogether, the Greek interest groups manifest less favourable attitudes, with a more pronounced discord between employers and trade unions, and also a higher level of indifference and distance towards the EC. This general observation does not apply to the central employers' organizations but is more in relation to certain sectoral organizations and trade unions.¹⁹

Most of the Turkish organizations regard the Association Agreement in a negative perspective with the exception of the Textile Organizations, the ISO (Istanbul Chamber of Industry) and the ATO (Ankara Chamber of Commerce). In their great majority, they are in favour of an immediate integration and expect that as a result of this the Turkish economy will gain in dynamism. Certain groups like the TGS (Turkish Journalists' Association) and the TESD (Associations of Turkish Artisans and Tradesmen) are of the opinion that the demand for integration should have been made under more favourable economic circumstances.

3. Adaptation of the interest groups to and their participation in the activities of the Community groups

The Greek central employers' organization has progressively established and developed relations at the European level since 1962, the date of the enactment of the Association Agreement. Since the

entry of Greece to the EC, these relations have been intensified. Becoming member of the UNICE after many years of contacts, the SEV is now a participator in the activities of the UNICE and in its working groups and keeps a permanent representative office in Brussels. It is also represented in a series of advisory organs. This institutional participation is reinforced by a network of informal contacts. Outside of that, the SEV has established close relations with the employers groups of many member countries, with those of Germany in particular. This multi-faceted participation is proliferated and reassured by many SEV leaders, especially its President.²⁰

Participation in sectoral organizations vary according to sectors. For example, the Union of Greek shipowners take part in the Council and also in the working groups of the Committee of Shipowners Association of the EC (CAACE) as well as the Economic and Social Committee since the entry of Greece into the EC. They maintain regular and frequent contacts with the Commission. On the other hand, the approach of the Union of Greek Cotton Industrialists and that of the Union of Greek Wool Mills display significant differences. While the cotton people participate actively in the activities of COMITEXTIL and of the Eurocoton, collaborate with the Commission and develop bilateral relations especially with their French and Italian counterparts; the wool people have only occasional contacts with the COMITEXTIL -which they consider an "overgrown monster"- commensurate with their expectations of information at reasonable cost.²¹ These two forms of participation reflect the modernistic-traditional dichotomy.

In different cases the participation is rendered difficult by an absence of equivalent structures at the EC level: the Union of Exporters of Industrial Products, for example, is represented sometimes through the Panhellenic Association of Exporters, or SEV or through the Ministry of Commerce.²²

PASEGES, member of COPA and of the COGECA work through a permanent representative office in Brussels which facilitates contacts with the Commission as well as its various committees or groups.

The level of participation is also high on the part of the organizations of architects, engineers, lawyers, medical doctors and especially on the part of the travel agents (Group of National Unions of Travel Agencies of the EC-under Greek chairmanship). Meanwhile, many other groups do not express as much a need for pursuing relations or being involved in organic cooperation with their counterparts in the Community.²³

The participation of the trade unions is marked by a considerable delay according to the GSEE and the Athens Labour Exchange themselves. The GSEE takes part in the activities of some commissions of the ECTU as well as in certain international sectoral organizations (eg. restaurant and tourism workers). The Federation of Textile Workers, although formally a member of the European Committee of Textiles, Garments and Leather Unions, declare themselves as a non-participant of any unionist activity at the European level which they consider lacking in class consciousness and class politics.²⁴

The consequences of the entry of Spain to the EC, as evaluated by the Spanish interest groups, are considered positive by the majority of representatives, both at the level of employers and of the trade unions. The structural adaptation has not created any problems, many of the organizations which were recently embodied have taken into account the European dimension and many of them have found there a stimulating factor or seen possibilities of support. From this point of view, also the collaboration on the part of Spanish and Portuguese interest groups towards the common goal of their parallel development is evident. One of the signs of the adaptation of the Spanish groups is the numerous surveys and analyses made by them concerning the EC, carried out for the purpose of assuring a more efficient representation at the EC level (3/4 of the 20 principals interviewed).²⁵

Spain is the leading country when considered in terms of new members in the Community groups, although it also has quite a few old members. Almost all the employer or trade union groups of any importance at the national level have taken part in one or more European organization. The effective participation in the European

associative life appears to have itself gained activity since the growing participation of Spain, in advisory or decision-making sessions.²⁶ All the interviewed employers' groups encourage their affiliates to become members to at least one European organization, almost a third of them are members to two or three Community organizations. Unions which sympathize with the SP or the SDP have good connections in the unionist groups at the Community level, the two other unions, the CNT and the Workers' Commission, having more internationalistic leanings than the others, wish to participate in the ESC. Altogether, participation in one or the other aspect of the Community by this or that group is being pursued with enthusiasm and with the aim of coordination of action at the European level.

The employers' organizations also maintain bilateral relations with their counterparts of other member countries, either directly or through the related European groups. One representative stated that these contacts were of decisive importance for his organization. Other spokesmen declared these relations complementary means serving to update information.²⁷

In nine cases out of ten, the participation is evaluated as positive, the appraisal of the employers' groups being slightly more positive than the unionist groups. In general, the participation of Spanish delegations in Brussels is, for the majority of groups, periodic but of a very high frequency and regularity. They vary depending on various factors: the importance and efficiency of the Community group, its power of influence as well as its level of intervention, the role of the EC in various sectors of the economy;²⁸ and above all the budgetary means which is rather low for Spanish groups limiting their levels of participation.²⁹ This last argument is also underlined with more emphasis by the spokesmen of the Portuguese groups. However these evaluations can be put in a relativistic perspective; the Portuguese participation being the least with the exception of the Greek groups. In all cases, the interest groups are inclined to complain of the insufficiency of means at their disposal.

In Portugal, the principal organizations have reinforced their structures and their capacities following entry into the EC. This led to

the acquisition of additional staff and helped accelerate modernisation of the equipment of certain groups. For example, the CCP has installed a permanent post in Brussels (1987) where it has representatives in about fifteen advisory committees. Since 1986, it has become member of the Federation of European Associations of Wholesale and Foreign Trade; its activities resting mostly on its sectoral associations, affiliated to European commercial groups. In the domains of industry and agriculture, the participation is mainly accomplished by the two central organizations, the CIP and the CAP and some sectoral groups oriented towards exportation, like the ones concerned with textiles. The degree of participation depends normally on the budgetary means of the national groups which they are endeavouring to expand since 1986, this leading the way also to a general reinforcement of the groups themselves.³⁰ The first of these organizations which established contacts at the European level has been the CIP, becoming first associate member then full member to the UNICE, it established a permanent representative office in Brussels since 1982. The CAP has also reinforced its representation by becoming member of the COPA in 1985, assuming its vice-presidency in 1987 and by establishing a permanent representative office in Brussels.

The situation at the level of the trade unions reflect the well known conflict; the entrance of the UGT to CISL since its creation has facilitated its subsequent affiliation to the ESC gaining it an advantage over its rival, the CGTP-IN, whose several attempts for acceptance into the ESC has remained fruitless. This inequality of access between the two confederations is partially neutralized by an equal representation by both of them at the Economic and Social Committee. The situation is expected to turn to normal as the CGTP-IN has since reiterated its claim for acceptance into the ESC.³¹

Since the country's entry into the EC, all the important Portuguese groups have intensified their activities at the Community level. The delegations representing all the groups take pains to travel regularly, about once a week, to Brussels to take part in various reunions, and especially in the meetings of the Economic and Social Committee. The Portuguese groups which have only recently

established contact with the Community organs appear to assign greater importance to the Economic and Social Committee than the other groups. This is also the case for the CGTP-IN who is kept outside of the ECTU.³²

The membership of the Turkish groups to related Community organs are at the level of 10% as compared to the groups of the other three countries of the South Europe, totaling up to only 15 in 1986. This level is below that of Spain at the time of its application for entry into the EC, and roughly comparable to that of Greece in a similar period. The TISK (Turkish Employers' Confederation) which had suspended its membership in the UNICE on account of financial deficiencies, has re-assumed its place there. An exceptional case, which requires mentioning is the case concerning the Turkish representatives of the textile industries who play a foremost role as the only spokesman in the Commission and who is also responsible for the distribution of annual quotas between the Turkish textile enterprises.³³

The Turkish groups' activity is probably comparable to the Greek groups in their participation in the Community organs, which gained momentum after Greece's entry into the EC. On the other hand, the process of integration of the Spanish and Portuguese groups has taken place much earlier and faster, mainly before 1980. Our survey in Greece indicated the existence of two conflicting approaches towards European integration in the industrial sectors; the food industries are better integrated than the other industrial branches; on the other hand, the textile industries (with the exception of cotton), chemistry and metallurgy appears to be insufficiently integrated in the Community groups. The inverse is observable in Spain, where most of the industrial groups are well integrated with the European groups with the exception of the food industries sector. In Portugal, the industrial groups are integrated unequally and on the average about half and half despite the recent progress made on the part of the central interest groups. In principle, the level of participation corresponds to the degree of attendance which can't be kept at a high level by the Portuguese or Greek groups on account of a more pronounced deficiency of means.³⁴

In the three countries the liberal professions, services and commerce are well represented with the exception of the Spanish craftsmen, the intensity of participation varying in terms of the impact the branch has at the Community level, the relative importance of the sectors concerned and their coverage in the EC as well as the means at their disposal. This observation which could be extended to other sectors, must be interpreted in the light of the perception that the leaders of the groups concerned regard their relations with the Community groups and the institutions of the EC in terms of a cost-benefit analysis. In the same order of thought, we have established that the agricultural groups are, in general, well integrated and more active as agriculture remains to be an important field of activity in the three countries, and the Community and constitutes a substantial form of encouragement within the framework of the CAP, also there are special contributions made to the agricultures of the South European countries. These inputs have sometimes also a significant political dimension, as in the case of Greece.

4. The functions of national interest groups as related to the EC

Among the principal functions of the interest groups with relation to the European integration, the following are the predominant ones: information, analysis, representation and coordination, influence (promotion and defence of interests). As elaborated in the past in our previous work,³⁵ the information function comes first in importance among the activities of the European groups. Progressively, with the development of the integration process, other functions also begin to assume importance. In the South European countries and especially in Spain and Portugal, their processes of democratization brought forward the legitimisation function of national groups through membership to the Community or international institutions. These contacts are in a way, the confirmation of their representativity and as an extension of that, an endorsement which mostly results in the reinforcement of their status and their capacity of influence at the national level.

In Greece, all the groups utilize the traditional channels of information -circulars, bulletins, reports etc.- to keep their members

abreast of current European problems, the exporters also operate a databank. The information is concentrated on specific questions like industrial development and the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes under SEV. The Technical Chamber and the PASEGES furnish, each, information that is rich and regular. On the other hand, the information provided appears insufficient from the side of trade unions, with the exception of the textiles trade union.³⁶

In Spain as well as in Portugal the demand for information has significantly increased since their integration. The dissemination of information is accomplished through the regular and periodic means to which publications and up to date reports are added. The forthcoming function of the groups, it appears, is to act as instruments for the retrieval and dissemination of information concerning the EC. They constitute a means of reducing the distance between their members and the EC, as well as of facilitating the action of their members in European matters. Thus, for example, the members of Portuguese organizations interviewed mostly regard their organizations more and more like a conveyor belt of information -evaluated as more efficient than national administrations- rather than real pressure groups.³⁷ Moreover, in the three countries, the leaders of the groups interviewed, in great majority, are of the opinion that the administrations furnish information parsimoniously and in parts and it is through their contacts and their participation at the Community level that the interest groups are informed of the prevailing problems and decisions taken in the Community. According to the principle of division of work, the general information is disseminated through the central organizations, the specialized organizations being responsible for sectoral information.

Other functions of the groups tend to develop as the impact of the EC on the tangible interests of their members increases: as a result of aggregation of the interests of its members and of definition of common attitudes; when representation and negotiation within groups or advisory organs of the EC is in question; or when elaboration of strategies and their coordination with those of other national groups is necessary and when protection of the interests of their members and influencing of the positions of the Community groups as well as the

decisions of the EC is required. Outside these functions of pressure group or lobbying, the interest groups assume also a more general role: they contribute by the diversity and richness of information to the transparency and through the plurality of the decision centres to the democratization of the socio-political system. This role of the national groups is reinforced by their integration within the network of European groups. Finally, all together and in their various levels and degrees they bring their contributions to the process of "European socialization" with their leaders and their members.

The means and opportunities used by the socio-economic groups of the three countries are fundamentally not different than those available to their European counterparts: the principal means are the advice, the reports and the positions the groups transmit to their European organizations and which they seek to evaluate in their own bodies preceding national or Community level events. It is only occasionally that groups use other means like the media or exceptional manifestations (eg. manifestations of European farmers organized by the COPA). The difference, according to the leaders of South European groups, as expressed in interviews with them, lies mainly in the magnitude of means available to them in the form of financial resources, the level of competence or the number of delegates or experts available. Also, for example, the Greek and Portuguese leaders mention insufficiency of financial resources and the difficulty which arises from that as an obstacle in the way of keeping an active and continuous participation within the professional and official organs of the EC.

5. Evaluation of the influence of the national interest groups at the Community level

The basic issue and also the most difficult one concerns the evaluation of the influence of the socio-economic groups on the process of decision-making both at the national and at the Community levels. In our previous studies devoted to this subject, we had to analyze and evaluate the weights of various indicators of power, investigate the various opportunities and means available to obtain results and through these various approaches, tried to reach on appraisal of the potential capacity of influence of interest groups.³⁸

This method which consists, to begin with, of approaching and surrounding a central problem by means which are easy to observe, is finally completed by an analysis of certain cases with regards exertion of influence. In full consciousness of the deficiencies of this approach, we have found it pertinent to extract certain general conclusions based on our observations, inquiries and our knowledge of the subject.

"Without carrying a general judgement, one can conclude that the predominance of specialised organizations is a sign of efficiency of technical action. General action, on the other hand, is difficult to define; a general agreement is mostly in the form of a compromise of approaches or ideas. When the decision rests on general problems it is imprecise and indistinct and has very little chance of exerting any real influence. On the other hand, technical action is more limited, but also much more precise. A draft regulation concerning beer or confectionary offered by European organizations has a much better chance of approval by the EC authorities than a commercial or anti-trust policy proposed by a central organization. When the European integration is realized, it appears that specialized, limited or technical influence will have an upper hand on general influence. This observation seems quite plausible as it is much more difficult to evaluate the general influence of organizations like the UNICE or the ESC as compared to the more precise and incisive action of, for example, COPA. However, this observation is not meant to give an exaggerated impression of the influence of specialized or technical groups".³⁹ A general evaluation of the influence of the interest groups is a hazardous exercise, it implies analyses of a multitude of factors in a chronological perspective as well as an appraisal of a complex model of inter-influences somewhat akin to a polygon of forces, of decisions and of pressures evolving from the framework of a special process which is in general inseparable from the overall national or Community level processes.

Due precautions taken, a concrete distinction, however, could be established between the general and the sectoral or specialized influence. Also the representatives of the Spanish groups, in general, value sectoral influence as much more effective and important than general influence. The responses to these questions are inversely proportional with 70% of the interviewed being pro-sectoral influence

maximum and about 65% judging general influence minimum.⁴⁰ The majority of the Spanish groups, subject to our research, are of the opinion that the capacity of influence of the groups are increasing following Spain's entry to the Community.⁴¹ The effect at the national level is clearly apparent, as perceived from the responses of the majority of our interviewees -whether from the trade unions' or the employers' side- that the influence of the professional organizations have increased since the entry of Spain into the EC.

This dimension occupies an important place in the views of the Portuguese and Greek socio-economic leaders. Also, being part of a European group greatly facilitates intervention in the decision-making process concerning Portugal.⁴² In the same way, for the representatives of the employers' organizations the integration of Portugal in the EC contributes to the reinforcement of the engagement of the country in a market economy system and obliges it to revise the constitution in that sense. This is, at least, their expectation, which also coincides with the efforts deployed by the SDP government and the outcome of which depend on the support of the Socialist Party.

The experience of the Greek groups merits further attention. . It is interesting to note that the evaluation of the principal Greek employers' groups of the European groups' influence, although quite laconically expressed, is inclined towards judging them as quite effective in general. Only the exporters are of the opinion that their influence is weak and the real power passes through the government and the European Parliament. This reference to the European Parliament suggests that the evaluation is largely a function of the relations and views of the interviewees and that it should be moderated given by the real weight that the European Parliament has in the Community system.

The Technical Chamber, the liberal professions and the PASEGES perceive the influence of the European groups differently, although the majority agree on attributing to them a real or potential part of influence. According to most of them, this influence is a function of the capacity of the European groups in formulating tangible and sectoral decisions.⁴³ Only the PASEGES made a critical

evaluation of the influences of the COPA and the COGECA on common agricultural policy. Nevertheless, this affirmation is greatly toned down by its following observation according to which the Commission takes back or modifies its proposals each time a strong majority of member groups of COPA opposes it, indicating thus their power of blockading.⁴⁴ When it comes to trade unions -as could be judged from their level of participation- they are mostly sceptical in this respect.

If one desires to find out how the national groups evaluate the capacity of influence of the European groups, it is significant in this context to receive their opinions on their own influence within the European socio-economic groups. In this respect, one can assume in principle that, those who attribute a high degree of influence to the European groups to which they are members, usually tend to evaluate their own influence positively within their European groups. Such is the case with the modernistic employers' fractions -SEV, EEE, Cotton- who claim to have a certain influence within the organizations to which they are members. Taking into account its resources and the dimensions of its membership, the SEV admits to be not as influential as the great European employers' organizations, while the EEE claims to have a great influence as it represents the most important merchant fleet in the EC. Various other groups like the PASEGES declare themselves influential within the European groups, that they are members to, like the COPA. To this end, the PASEGES emphasizes that it is essential, for the protection of the interests of the group in question, to seek alliances with its counterparts of the other member countries. Finally -with surprise- one finds that the majority of the representatives of the workers consider themselves as influential on the Community groups that they are member to, due to their connections. This affirmation raises doubts and one tends to suspect wishful thinking on the part of certain groups. It is a general tendency, observed regarding various groups, to overrate their influence in an attempt to increase their importance in front of their members and the decision-making bodies.

The principal Greek groups agree in majority that their affiliation to European organizations has had a positive effect on their relations

with the government.⁴⁵ For example, the Association of Medical Doctors, declare that their affiliation to the related European organization renders them able to criticize the government policy whenever it deviates from the decisions taken at the Community level. The Bar declares that their relations with the government and the Ministry of Justice are quite good and they collaborate quite well therefore they have no reason to criticise the government. While many other groups complain of a lack of consultation on the part of the government, the PASEGES, on the contrary, claim that they exchange information and assistance with the Ministry of Agriculture and that its participation in the Community groups has gained it the advantage of informal but continuous collaboration with the Ministry of Agriculture.⁴⁶ This collaboration in the agricultural sector is not peculiar to Greece but is encountered in most of the EC countries; in France, in FRG, in Denmark or in Italy but mostly in Spain and in Portugal. Many arguments have been raised in explanation of this phenomenon, especially stressing the fact that agriculture -often in difficulty or regression- remains as a sector politically and socially worthy of attention or some sort of special protection by the governments. Some workers' organizations appear to draw certain benefits from their international or European affiliations especially in the form of support for their claims for the restoration of their positions at home. On the whole, with the exception of certain Greek groups, the groups from the South of Europe are of the opinion that the governments keep them out of the process of decision-making. Contrary to what happens in the other European countries, the practice of consultation with socio-economic groups doesn't appear to be a general tendency. Probably, the entry of a country to the EC and of its national groups to the European groups, contribute to the development of the process of consultation which many governments practise regardless of their political colour. Finally, one can wonder, if other substitutes in relations exist in the many cases that prevail, especially in the form of personal relations. Already there is good reason to believe that the foreseeable evolution in the countries of the South of Europe will progressively increase the transparency of relations between the enterprises and their groups on the one hand and the governmental bodies on the other.

CONCLUSIONS

Despite the structural differences among them and a certain degree of inconsistency in their timing of affiliation to European groups, the interest groups of the three new member countries display comparable modes of behaviour, often in convergence. With their return to democracy, the emerging interest groups of the three new members have found themselves stronger and with more autonomy with regards the government and the political parties. In this way, they contribute to an increase in the representation of diverse socio-economic interests and to the revival of social pluralism.

Taking as an example the general process of creation of the Community groups, the central national organizations were the first to integrate with the large European organizations like the UNICE, COPA and the ESC. The *process of integration* of the sectoral groups also conform with the general trend observed in the EC: the interests most affected by the policies and decisions at the Community level tend to integrate first, the others follow gradually in relation to the rate at which Community level action penetrates their field of activity. In Greece and in Portugal, first the central and then the sectoral national groups affiliated to the EC groups, while in Spain -as a result of the autonomy of regions- this process at the national level was followed by the affiliation of a certain number of regional groups. This regionalization is also reflected within the national groups, in the composition of their leaders and in the distribution of authority.

An analysis of the attitudes of the principal responsables of the interest groups as taken as basic factors of behaviour, leads to the conclusion that their attitudes are in general positive from the viewpoint of general policy. In fact, the groups are of the opinion that the entry of their countries to the EC would constitute a firm anchor to the democratic Europe reinforcing the stability of their young democracies. On the other hand, as one lingers about in individual domains and especially within various sectors, one finds that the attitudes become more subtle, more prudent and even more reserved. The fear of unequal competition from enterprises better equipped and technologically much more advanced begins to show itself. However, with the integration accomplished and in direct contact with the EC,

these apprehensions begin to subside and turn into an attitude which is more positive and active in pursuit of profit from the opportunities and the advantages offered by the integration with the EC.

This upwards trend corresponds, in general, to the development of the *public opinion* in the three countries; the descending public opinion concerning integration with the EC in Greece since 1981, has turned up following 1983 reaching the 50% limit by 1987 and a little over that in 1988; in Portugal, the ratio of those in favour of integration was about 30% between 1980 and 1985, it made a jump between 1985 and 1987 attaining a value of about 60% in 1987, with a small decrease, it is slightly over 50% in 1988; the opinions concerning the beneficial consequences follow the same evolution between 1986 and 1988 and remain slightly below those in favour of integration; in Spain, the public opinion in favour of integration has remained relatively stable and increased only slightly between 1980 and 1988 exceeding the 60% mark; but contrary to the other two countries, the opinions concerning the beneficial consequences display a considerable difference compared to the opinion on entry: while remaining at a much lower level, it rises by 15% in 1986 to near 25% in 1988.⁴⁷

By comparison, the *adaptation* of the Greek interest groups appears quite slow to proceed and their *participation* in the Community level activities less effective with the exception of the central employers' organization and the shipowners. Although, becoming a member six years later, Spain has reached the level of 167 in 1980 and of 189 in 1986, numbers much above the number of Greek groups taking part within Community level groups. The dimensions and diversification of its economy which is much beyond those of the Greek economy is probably the decisive factors in this development. The comparison of the rates of affiliation of the Greek and Portuguese groups is interesting to note; in 1980 the number of Portuguese groups affiliated was 85 as compared to 66 of Greece; however Greece has caught up with and surpassed Portugal in 1986 with 154 against 113. It appears that, the constitution or rather re-constitution of the Spanish and Portuguese interest groups with the return to democracy of these countries, enables their adaptation to be faster and their need for affiliation to and their participation in the Community level groups

larger. In a lesser degree, these factors are equally valid for Greece.

The employers-trade unions *conflict* which is more pronounced in Greece as compared to the other two countries is also discernable in the attitudes as well as in the degrees of participation of the interest groups. The intensity of participation appears, in a way, less than that which prevails in Spain or Portugal, on account of the existence of trade unions close to the governmental parties and which participate more actively within the ESC. However, the intensity of participation, although indicative of the influences of employers -trade unions and communist- socialist conflicts, equally depends on the respective weights of other factors like the impact of the Community level policies and decisions on the interest groups, the importance of the sectors affected, their opening up to the EC and on the resources available to the interest groups concerned.

An *analysis of the functions* of the interest groups reveals a confirmation of the results previously obtained: to begin with, access to information plays a predominant role, next to that come functions of representation, common strategies and the protection of being attached which increases as the field of influence of the EC grows. Also of importance, is the fact that the more the impact of the EC becomes tangible and immediate the larger is the spectrum of functions with regard to Community affairs that the interest groups assume.

The *real degree of influence* of the interest groups is also rather difficult to assess as the groups tend to manifest a general inclination towards overestimating their influences. In this perspective, it is quite probable that they slightly exaggerate the importance and influence of the Community groups also, to emphasize their own weights at the European level. Despite all these overevaluations, all the groups confirm that their joining the Community groups and their participation at that level increased their capacities of access and their influences within their governments. In this context the Turkish textile groups constitute an extreme exception.

As a rule, the national interest groups are directly in touch with the Community echelons without passing through the channels of the national administrations. This direct access at the European level also

reinforces their positions in negotiations at the national level. However, there is another mode of approach also observed as regards the national groups, which involves using their access at the level of national administrations as an additional means of influence to affect the decisions of the Council where national ministers sit and vote.⁴⁸

All the experience gained from studies on the interest groups indicate that the global and general influence of the groups is more difficult to ascertain as a result of the various factors and actors which enter the play, saying nothing of the pressures, informal influences due to certain situations, to the atmosphere or to the dominant ideas of the moment as well as the "invisible" interaction of people, of groups and of officials. The complexity of the global socio-political processes makes it difficult to assess the parts of influence attributable to various actors. On the other hand, our inquiries confirm most of our previous conclusions and especially the one that in the present state of the European integration, the sectoral influence which is more specific, more technical and somewhat more striking is also less easily distinguishable by the available techniques of observation. Meanwhile, by concentrating our analysis on the groups of interest themselves, we kept ourselves away from fallacies which may lead to overemphasizing their weights on the European and national level decision-making processes. In reality, as a result of our work, we reached the conclusion that the weights of the European as well as the national groups of interest on processes of decision-making and management at the Community level remain rather modest as compared to those of the governments and their representatives. Also, the degree that the governments could be influenced by their groups is variable with respect to the country concerned. The fact remains that alongside institutional centres of decision, the political parties and the electors, the groups -reflecting a multitude of socio-economic interests- assume a variable but effective role in their national communities and also in the European political community that is being shaped.

NOTES

1. D. Sidjanski, **Europe élections: de la démocratie européenne**, Paris, Stanké, 1979.
2. J. Meynaud and D. Sidjanski, **Les groupes de pression dans la Communauté européenne 1958-1968**, Bruxelles, Editions de l'Institut de Sociologie, 1971.
3. D. Sidjanski and Ural Ayberk, "Bilan des groupes et du processus de décision dans la Communauté européenne des Six" **Res Publica** No 1, 1974 and "Le nouveau visage des groupes d'intérêt comunautaires" **Revue d'intégration européenne**, No 2 and 3, 1987.
4. The collection of data on the groups of the south of Europe has been completed following 84 in-depth interviews with the leaders of the central employers' organizations, commercial unions, agriculturist organizations, the trade unions as well as with some sectoral organizations (**Report** by D. Sidjanski and U. Ayberk submitted to the Volkswagenwerke Foundation-SVW in October 1987, pp 13-15).
5. D. Sidjanski and U. Ayberk, **Rapport sur les partis politiques et les groupes d'intérêt en Europe du Sud dans leur relations avec les formations et groupes européenne**, Stiftung Volkswagenwerke (SVW), October 1987, pp 9 and 10.
6. G. Marques, p. 3 and C. Garcia, p.4
7. G. Marques, pp. 3 and 4; C. Garcia pp. 5, 6 and 25. In the final elections the Spanish UGT has obtained the greatest number of delegates followed by the CC.OO. which has the majority in various cities and large industrial enterprises.
8. G. Marques, pp. 5 and 6.
9. G. Marques, p.2
10. C. Garcia, pp. 6 and 7.

11. J. Condomines, "Les syndicalistes parlementaires en Espagne", Department of Political Science, Geneva, 1984.
12. A. Melich, pp. 4 to 7.
13. A. Melich, pp. 13, 15, 16, 20.
14. U. Ayberk and E. Boduroğlu, p.1.
15. *ibid*, pp. 3 to 5.
16. *ibid*, pp. 9, 11, 29.
17. C. Garcia, pp. 8-10.
18. G. Marques, pp. 9-11 and 19-20.
19. M. Aligisakis, I. Papadopulos, M. Cossina, pp. 5-6.
20. *ibid*, p. 11.
21. The contacts are considered difficult on account of cost and therefore not established except on occasional visits of individual members of the Union.
22. *ibid*, pp. 11 and 12.
23. *ibid*, pp. 12 and 13.
24. *ibid*, pp. 13 and 14.
25. C. Garcia, pp. 15 and 16.
26. *ibid*, pp. 17 and 18.
27. *ibid*, pp. 18 and 19.
28. See. D. Sidjanski and U. Ayberk "Bilan des groupes...", **Res Publica**, 1974, which emphasises the parallelism between the weights of action and Community level policies on the one hand and the emergence or importance

of the Community groups on the other.

29. C. Garcia, pp. 20 and 21.
30. G. Marques, pp. 7, 8 and 9.
31. *ibid*, pp. 14 and 15.
32. *ibid*, p. 16.
33. U. Ayberk and E. Boduroğlu, pp. 11 and 33.
34. *ibid*, pp. 33 to 35.
35. J. Meynaud and D. Sidjanski, *L'Europe des affaires*, Paris, Payot, 1967 and *Les groupes de pression dans la Communauté européenne*, *op.cit*; D. Sidjanski and U. Ayberk "Bilan des groupes et du processus de décision dans la Communauté des Six", *Res Publica*, *op.cit.* and "Le nouveau visage des groupes d'intérêt communautaires", *op.cit.*
36. M. Aligisakis, I. Papadopoulos, M. Cossina, pp. 23 to 25.
37. C. Garcia, pp. 16 and 17; G. Marques, pp. 10 and 11.
38. See our works realized mostly with Jean Meynaud, Ural Ayberk, José Barroso and Jonas Condomines. In our analyses we have made reference to indicators of the capacity to influence such as: 1. The importance of the sector and the grouping in the sector in terms of turnover, % of workers and the sales; 2. the importance and the validity of the cause or interests defended; 3. the representivity and the number of its members, eg. unions, farmers, enterprises; 4. financial assets; 5. organization and efficiency: a) actual number of staff, b) competence of administrators, c) their authority and prestige; 6. image and reputation of the group; 7. homogeneity or divisions; 8. relations with other groups (coalitions, rivalries); 9. means of contact with or access to institutions and centres of decision.

39. D. Sidjanski "Les groupes de pression dans la Communauté européenne" II **Politico**, 1982, No. 3, pp. 559 and 560.
40. C. Garcia, pp. 22 and 23.
41. **ibid**, pp. 43 and 44.
42. G. Marques, p. 13.
43. M. Aligisakis, I. Papadopoulos, M. Cossina, pp. 17 and 18. This observation assumes that the European groups are in a position to take decisions.
44. **ibid**, p. 18.
45. **ibid**, p. 15-17.
46. **ibid**, pp. 29 and 30.
47. **Eurobaromètre** no. 29, June 1988.
48. See the general action diagram of Community and national groups in our article "Les groupes de pression dans la Communauté européenne" in **II politico**, no. 3, 1982, pp. 553-555.