

Theoretical overview
Citizens, citizenship and European Union: an open bet? The culture of legality
Salvatore Di Piazza and Sorina Soare

Citizenship and citizens are typical social science concepts easy to use in common language, but definitely difficult to circumscribe in scientific debates. However, events in the last years have shown their complexity. In the context of the so-called “migration crisis” that has been challenging the settings of the European Union (EU) since 2014 in parallel with the most recent bloody terrorist attacks in Paris or Brussels, long-standing questions about the values and rights of nationals vs. foreigners multiplied. In this context, direct and indirect references to the values of liberal democracies have pushed the concepts out of theoretical debates and more than ever, citizens and citizenship have the chance to be not only politically and legally recognized concepts by (supranational, national or sub-national) institutions, but also civically endorsed ones. If we continue this reflection in relation to the EU values and principles enshrined in the Treaties, the concept of EU citizenship refers to those values that are considered to be the basis for a so-called European ‘way of life’ that goes beyond a market-based economic union. This simple shift in perspective can help us to connect with the topic of the project “Waves of citizenship, waves of legality” funded under the Europe for Citizens Program. The project aimed to reinforce the role of organized civil society in combating and preventing crime and to foster the co-operation between the law enforcement system and civil society as exercises of participative democracy. In synthesis, the project aimed to enhance European citizenship and improve conditions for civic and democratic participation at Union level¹ by laying emphasis on the need to connect three main key-issues: EU citizenship – active citizenship – legality.

1.1. Introductory remarks: citizenship in retreat?

Several introductory remarks are necessary. The first element to focus on is the very concept of citizenship. A minimal definition of citizenship can be reconnected with the doctrine of human rights and Hannah Arendt’s famous emphasis on the concept of recognition of the right to membership to a political community (n.a. “the right to have rights”)². For Arendt this recognition did not refer to a right dependent on nation or race; the concept valorized instead a universal right to belong to some kind of organized community encompassed as a confined space where civil, political and social rights

¹ One of the main general objectives of the Program (art. 1 ^2b) as stated by the Council Regulation (EU) No 390/2014 of 14 April 2014 establishing the ‘Europe for Citizens’ programme for the period 2014-2020, OJ L 115, 17.4.2014, p. 3–13, available at: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=OJ:JOL_2014_115_R_0002&qid=1398334046443, last accessed 28 March 2016.

² Hannah Arendt (1949), “*The Rights of Man*”: *What Are They?*, *Modern Review*, vol 3(1), p. 34.

could be realized³. Beyond this basic assumption, note should be taken that, according to the literature, the meanings of citizenship are both context and time dependent; the codification of citizenship has to be interpreted as the outcome of more or less fluid processes filtered by specific domestic and/or international political projects shaped by the *Zeitgeist* of their origins. All in all, the concept of citizenship is treated by the literature as a heterogeneous one, subject to major variances across time and space⁴.

Beyond these nuances, according to one of the most knowledgeable scholars in the field of political science dealing with this issues, Rainer Bauböck⁵, citizenship is a “concept with multiple dimensions” and complex theoretical boundaries that can be synthetized in reference to “equal membership in a self-governing political community”⁶. The polysemic nature of the concept, continues Bauböck, becomes even more visible if we refer to the four main interpretations of citizenship that, taken together, depict contemporary democratic citizenship. More specifically, the scholar refers to the citizenship as “(1) a formal legal status that links individuals to a state or another established polity (such as the European Union or a federal province); (2) a bundle of legal rights and duties associated with this status, including civil liberties, rights to democratic representation, and social rights to education, health care, and protection from poverty risks; (3) a set of responsibilities, virtues, and practices that support democratic self-government; (4) a collective identity that can be shared across distinctions of class, race, gender, religion, ethnic origin, or way of life”⁷. All these dimensions are conducive to the liberal definition of democracy as a government accountable to its citizens within a (constitutionally) codified territorial jurisdiction. However, considering that citizenship is an element shaped by specific historical configurations, it is not surprising that, in the 21st century, the challenges to the traditional nation-state have had a direct impact upon the very perception and definition of citizenship. More specifically, the traditional relationship between the state and the individual living on its territory together with the rights and duties associated with a political community are increasingly challenged by a wide range of phenomena (i.e. economic globalization, cultural globalization, regional integration and the proliferation of supra-national entities, etc.). At the turn of the 21st century, references to “national” definitions of citizenship prove to be still highly appealing. Numerous parties and movements claim the urgent need to relocate the sovereignty at the level of the national territory and to limit the (re)distribution of resources and wealth to those individuals and groups of individuals

³ Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, Harcourt Books, New York, 1994, p. 296.

⁴ John Clarke, Kathleen Coll, Evelina Dagnino, and Catherine Neveu (2014), *Disputing Citizenship*, Policy Press, University of Bristol, p. 10.

⁵ Rainer Bauböck (2008), *Stakeholder Citizenship: An Idea Whose Time Has Come?*, Migration Policy Institute, available at: <http://www.migrationpolicy.org/research/stakeholder-citizenship-idea-whose-time-has-come>, last accessed: 28 March 2016.

⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 2.

⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 3.

territorially and/or ethnically entitled to⁸. For these actors, the rhetoric of the state in retreat fully overlaps with discourses about a “national” citizenship undermined by supranational politics coupled with processes of economic and cultural globalization. Overall, the once stable cross-party consensus about the content and definition of citizenship vanished into thin air, being replaced by a wide spectrum of anxieties over cultural incompatibilities, failed integration, security risks, etc.

The “controversy” surrounding the meaning and definition of citizenship arise from the fact that we are dealing with a concept historically connected with nation-building and the progressive evolution of the rights and duties of both the states and their citizens. How contemporary individuals/groups interact with their state and affect each other, but also the evolution of the state in terms of legitimacy and territorial/jurisdictional authority point out to the need to refer to an “imperfect” citizenship meaning. In other words, we are dealing with a “defective” hence “improvable” institution, it is also a practice and a process “in the making”⁹. This is a fertile lens of interpretation for the concept of EU Citizenship.

1.2. The challenges of the European Citizenship

The definition of the EU citizenship together with the set of rights granted to all Member states’ citizens is the result of a process launched in the aftermath of the 1974 summit in Paris and the June 1984 European Council at Fontainebleau¹⁰. In both occasions, the debate focused on the need to broaden the legal provisions from economic matters to symbolic investments in the political linkages between the citizens of the MSs and the European project and its identity¹¹. From Maastricht and Lisbon until the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU, the European citizen was to be endorsed as “the heart” of the European activities.

The EU citizenship was first legally codified in 1992 under the Treaty of Maastricht (Part two, Citizenship of the Union, article 8-8E)¹². According to art. 8¹ of the Maastricht Treaty, every person who holds the nationality of a Member State (MS) becomes “a citizen of the Union” and, as such, enjoys the rights (i.e. the right to move and reside freely within the territory of the MSs, the right to vote and to stand as a candidate at municipal elections in the Member State in which he resides under the same conditions as nationals of that State, the right to vote and to stand as a candidate in elections

⁸ Marco Tarchi, *L'Italia populista. Dal qualunquismo a Beppe Grillo*, Il Mulino, Bologna, 2015.

⁹ These comments are based on Balibar’s definition of citizenship analyzed by John Clarke et al., *op. cit.*, p. 11.

¹⁰ See the “Adonnino Report” - Report to the European Council by the ad hoc committee “On a People’s Europe”, A 10.04 COM 85, SN/2536/3/85, available at: <http://www.ombudsman.europa.eu/en/resources/historicaldocument.faces/en/4659/html.bookmark>, last access: 29 March 2016.

¹¹ Marco Martiniello, *op. cit.*, p. 30.

¹² Treaty on European Union as signed in Maastrich 1992, available at: http://europa.eu/eu-law/decision-making/treaties/pdf/treaty_on_european_union/treaty_on_european_union_en.pdf, last access 29 March 2016.

to the European Parliament (EP) in the MS State in which he/she resides, the right to protection by the diplomatic or consular authorities in the territory of a third country in which the MS of which he/she is a national is not represented, the right to petition the EE, etc.)¹³. Last but not least, the newly defined citizenship specified that the citizens of the MSs shall not be discriminated on the basis of their national identity when the Treaty applied. The entire process could be synthesized in the attempt to make the newly created EU more democratic¹⁴.

The Lisbon Treaty¹⁵ and the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights¹⁶ further broadened the EU citizens' rights in relation to the citizens' initiative right. According to art. 11[^] TEU, it is stated that "not less than one million citizens who are nationals of a significant number of Member States may take the initiative of inviting the Commission, within the framework of its powers, to submit any appropriate proposal on matters where citizens consider that a legal act of the Union is required for the purpose of implementing the Treaties". Finally yet importantly, according to the treaty, the EU Citizenship is perceived as a status additional to the national one¹⁷.

Celebrated initially as the burial of the old technocratic, economic and elitist Europe tantamount to a "new political Europe where the citizens were to play a central part"¹⁸, the European citizenship rapidly became a contested topic. The theoretical disputes surrounding the definition and meaning of a transnational citizenship were fueled by the limited appeal of the European citizenship on the ground. Beyond the juridical basis to EU citizenship, the European civil society failed to take roots¹⁹.

The European institutions, *in primis* the EC, were actively involved in monitoring the implementation of the EU citizenship. Five reports on the implementation of the EU citizenship since the Treaty of Maastricht were published by the EC²⁰. Based on a public consultation on the topic of EU citizenship launched in 2010, the EC published a first Citizenship report²¹, accompanied by a supplementary report²² and a Report on the evaluation of the 2009 European Parliament elections. The three reports openly aimed to evaluate the status of the post-Maastricht new political dimension of the Union and, in

¹³ Art. 8-8E.

¹⁴ Marco Martiniello (1994), "Citizenship of the European Union. A Critical View", in Rainer Bauböck (ed.), *From Aliens to Citizens: Redefining the Status of Immigrants in Europe*, Aldershot, Avebury, pp. 29-48.

¹⁵ The Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (Part II Non Discrimination and Citizenship of the Union, art. 20-24), OJ C 326, 26.10.2012, p. 47-390, available at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=celex%3A12012E%2FTXT>, last access: 29 March 2016.

¹⁶ Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, OJ C 326, 26.10.2012, available at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:12012P/TXT>, last access: 29 march 2016.

¹⁷ The Treaty of Amsterdam defined the EU citizenship as a complement of the national one.

¹⁸ Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union.

¹⁹ The gap between the provisions from the Treaties and the EU citizens' daily lives was put forward by numerous Eurobarometer surveys as well as by the EC public consultation concluded on June 2010.

²⁰ Full list of reports and attached documents available at: http://ec.europa.eu/justice/citizen/index_en.htm

²¹ EU Citizenship Report 2010. Dismantling the obstacles to EU citizens' rights, Brussels, 27.10.2010 COM(2010) 603 final, available at: http://ec.europa.eu/justice/citizen/files/com_2010_603_en.pdf, last accessed 29 march 2016.

²² Report from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council and the European Economic and Social Committee under article 25 FTEU On progress towards effective EU Citizenship 2007-2010, Brussels, 27.10.2010 COM(2010) 602 final, available at: http://ec.europa.eu/justice/citizen/files/com_2010_602_en.pdf, last access: 29 March 2016.

particular, the original rights of free movement, the political rights, the freedom from discrimination on nationality and the right to consular protection. A list of 25 main obstacles were identified and 25 key actions to improve citizens' lives were publically endorsed²³. In May 2012, the EC launched an online public consultation on EU citizenship together with citizens' dialogues aiming to gather concerns and suggestions for a better Europe²⁴. In parallel, Eurobarometer surveys targeted the EU citizenship and electoral rights²⁵. Among the complexities of the EU citizenship, the reports identified different obstacles in relation to the free movement, in most of the cases linked to complex or unclear administrative procedures, and the local staff limited awareness of the EU rights. Note that, for the younger generations, the recognition of diplomas was a major issue.

In this area, a specific attention has to be dedicated to the implementation of the "Europe for Citizens" Program (2007-2013) with the aim "to bring Europe closer to its citizens and to enable them to participate fully in the European construction". Transnational exchanges and cooperation activities were seen as pragmatic investments in reinforcing the sense of belonging to EU values and EU process of integration. Beyond the coordination of the Education, Audiovisual and Culture Agency Executive Agency (EACEA), under the supervision of the DG COMM of the European Commission, European for Citizens Points were organized in the MSs in order to smooth participation in the Program. The overall budget of the Program was of 215MEURO. In order to tackle the specific challenges identified by the different surveys, reports and consultations coordinated by the EU institutions, a specifically tailored program was launched: "Fundamental Rights and Citizenship" (2007-2013), integrated within the General Program "Fundamental Rights and Justice". Finally yet importantly, the topic was included among the funding opportunities of research in the field of social sciences and humanities. More specifically, under the seventh Framework Program a specific area of funding was dedicated to the "The Citizen in the European Union". In the spring of 2014, the Council of the European Union has unanimously adopted the Regulation of the new "Europe for Citizens" (2014-2020) with two thematic focuses: (1) the "European Remembrance" and (2) "Democratic engagement and civic participation". Despite the good evaluations of the above-mentioned programs, the list of weaknesses and obstacles was still valid. In 2013, the EC released the second EU Citizenship Report²⁶ focused on the progresses registered in the 25 areas identified by the 2010 report. Consequently, 12 new initiatives and 6 key areas

²³ 2010 EU Citizenship Report 25 key actions to improve citizens' lives, available at: http://ec.europa.eu/justice/citizen/files/2010_citizenship_report_key_actions_en.pdf, last access: 29 march 2016.

²⁴ The EU Citizens' Agenda Europeans have their say, 2012, available at http://ec.europa.eu/justice/citizen/files/eu-citizen-brochure_en.pdf, last access 29 march 2016.

²⁵ Flash Eurobarometer 365 EUROPEAN UNION CITIZENSHIP REPORT, 2012, available at: http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/flash/fl_365_en.pdf, last access 29 march 2016; Flash Eurobarometer 364 ELECTORAL RIGHTS REPORT, 2012, last access:: 29 march 2016.

²⁶ EU Citizenship Report 2013, available at: http://ec.europa.eu/justice/citizen/files/2013eucitizenshipreport_en.pdf, last access 30 march 2016.

were put forward in order to enhance a EU effective citizenship²⁷. The 2016 Flash Eurobarometers together with the Commission Public Consultation “EU Citizenship: Share your opinion on our common values, rights and democratic participation” illustrated how numerous obstacles still hinder the effective implementation of the EU Citizenship. In preparation of the 2016 EU Citizenship Report, a Hearing on EU Citizenship was organized by the European Commission (DG Justice and Consumers) and the European Parliament (LIBE, PETI, AFCO and JURI Committees) in order to assess a simplified exercise of EU citizens’ rights in their daily life, together with increased democratic participation²⁸.

The complex status/state of the EU citizenship is perfectly illustrated by the 2016 Flash Eurobarometer requested by the EC²⁹. According to the survey, although 87% of the respondents were familiar with the term ‘citizen of the European Union’ (+6% in comparison with the 2012 Survey, +9% in relation to 2007 Survey), only half of them were able to define it. Among the various rights associated with the EU citizenship, the respondents were most familiar with the right to free movement and the right to petition EU institutions. Still, only 26% of them declared themselves informed about the options available if their rights as an EU citizen were not respected. In relation to the political rights, the respondents were particularly aware of their electoral rights, a wide majority considering that EU citizens living in countries other than their country of origin should acquire electoral rights in the national and regional elections in the country in which they are residing.

While the official documents regularly put emphasis on the enhancement of the efficiency and democratic legitimacy of the Union, the definition of the EU in political terms remains rather contested. The concept of EU citizenship remains somehow isolated in a juridical limbo, floating between its recognized legal declinations and the national challenges from numerous populist parties arguing in favor of restoring the genuine ‘democratic principles’. As we earlier observed in this introduction, phenomena such as globalization, immigration or terrorism intensified in last decade with a weakening effect on the political dimension of the EU, with far-reaching ramifications covering not only general economic and political dimensions of EU politics, but also the concept of EU citizenship. In line with the by-effects of the influxes of migrants and refugees on the EU capacity to reach consensus among MSs, it looks like the original Westphalia state system, based on national/territorial sovereignty and the monopoly on the exercise of means of violence, is still valid. Suffice is to remind that EU institutions are no longer able to find common denominators while national governments have less interests/incentives in committing to European compromises. Indeed, most of the national governments seem to be afraid of losing control of their traditional electorates attracted by national-

²⁷ See for example the 2014 brochure “Did you know? 10 EU rights at a glance”, available at: <http://bookshop.europa.eu/en/did-you-know--pbNA0414127/>, last access 30 march 2016.

²⁸ Hearing on EU Citizenship in practice: our common values, rights and democratic participation, 15 march 2016, available at: http://ec.europa.eu/justice/newsroom/citizen/events/160201_en.htm, last access 30 march 2016.

²⁹ Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/justice/citizen/document/files/2016-flash-eurobarometer-430-citizenship_en.pdf

populist tribunes, as illustrated by the most recent elections in Slovakia. Optimistic forecasts are still valid and the project “Waves of citizenship, waves of legality” is part of them. The project activities and the country-reports included in this volume chronicle how it is still possible to intervene in enhancing the EU dimension of the project historically based on promoting peace, wellbeing and solidarity. Through their reports, the authors transcend the national dimension of their inquiries. They provide concrete inputs for how it is still possible for EU citizens to become effectively engaged in EU decision-making, to promote mutual understanding and to develop a way of dealing with such a sensitive topic as organized crime. The added value of the country reports relies on the constant evaluation of both social and legal dimensions of the phenomenon under inquiry. Significantly, all of them highlight the need to take into account the transnational dimension of the phenomenon and the limited capacities of the traditional Westphalian State to deal with these new challenges.

Although strongly contested, the EU is the only viable solution in this context. We strongly believe that the European perspective can increase the young generations' understanding of ways in which citizens can induce change and improve democracy. This is why the Falcone Foundation's led project represents a concrete investment in bringing together young people from 8 MS and 2 candidate countries in order to share and exchange experiences in the area of the fight against organized crime. It concretely allows a group of heterogeneous young people to learn from the best practices of their own national strategies of enhancing legality. It provides a solid platform of dialogue for future exchanges among the participating groups and openly aspires to encourage a wider dialogue for reinforcing the connection between EU citizenship and the EU area of freedom, security and justice.

Once again the recent events in Brussels are particularly useful for understanding the complexity of the challenges in relation to the management of the EU's external borders and the need to smoothen judicial cooperation and police cooperation in the fight against terrorism. In brief, as illustrated by the 10 country reports, there is a strong consensus that an effective fight against organized crime requires common action, common values and trust. In other words, this is not only about shared definitions, legal bases and institutional cooperation in criminal matters, but also about a community founded on values and principles set out in article 2 of the Treaty on European Union: “the Union is based on the values of respect for human dignity, freedom, democracy, equality, the rule of law and respect for human rights, including the rights of persons belonging to minorities”.

2. Legality vs. organized crime: a bottom up approach

We cannot define democracy without direct references to rule of law or, in other words, a political system that requires that “the state only subject the citizenry to publicly promulgated laws that the state's legislative function be separate from the adjudicative function, and that no one within the polity

be above the law.”³⁰ When stating that laws bind everyone in a democratic system including the government, we directly refer to the constitutional limits on power. Beyond these procedural elements, a substantive interpretation of the rule of law can and has to incorporate elements linked to a so-called culture of legality. In this perspective, from a top down perspective, the rule of law refers to the existence of an independent judiciary that guarantees liberty and equality. From a bottom up perspective, a functional rule of law requires a broad recognition of the legal stands within the society. Without a positive perception of legal norms within the society, the overall performance the democratic system diminishes. The culture of legality refers to the society as the sum of ordinary citizens and public officials that voluntarily accept the compliance with the norms and principles of the legal system. Beyond these elements, the complexity of a project that focused on the linkage between legality and (active) citizenship is further increased by the focus on organized crime, a phenomenon with multiple facets and definitions. The diverse legal traditions co-existing within the EU explain the difficulties in identifying a joint European framework since the early 1990s³¹. Generally associated with groups having formalized structure and whose primary objective is to obtain money through illegal activities by using “actual or threatened violence, corrupt public officials, graft, or extortion”³², most recently, “the use of the term “organized crime”, once predominant, has declined in favor of “serious crime”. This change marks a “shift of focus from the structure of criminal groups to the harm they inflict on individuals and societies”³³.

Beyond these semantic nuances and policy approaches, the project “Waves of citizenship, waves of legality”, coordinated by Fondazione Giovanni e Francesca Falcone, represented an interesting point of departure to depict the youth-oriented active citizenship policies in relation to the culture of legality. More specifically, the project laid emphasis on the narrow relationship between youth polices and the prevention and fight against organized crime. Even though the background and the perspective adopted by the authors in their analyses are rather heterogeneous, the results are highly interesting. All the 10 chapters succeed in grasping the complexity of the phenomenon and the difficulties existing domestic policy have to face in order to adapt to flexible structures.

Let us now have a more detailed look at each chapter!

The first chapter is dedicated to the Italian case. After a brief overview of the active citizenship policies for youth and a picture of Italian youth (focus on demographic trends, economic conditions, level of education and employment, relationship with the voluntary work), the author focuses on the wider phenomenon of juvenile deviance and dedicates the final part of the analysis to the specific case of the

³⁰ Michael Rosenfeld, *Modern Constitutionalism as Interplay Between Identity and Diversity*, in Michael Rosenfeld (ed.) *Constitutionalism, Identity, Difference, and Legitimacy: Theoretical Perspectives*, Duke University Press, 1994, p. 3.

³¹ *The EU response to organised crime*, 06 settembre 2009, disponibile a: [http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/bibliotheque/briefing/2013/130625/LDM_BRI\(2013\)130625_REV1_EN.pdf](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/bibliotheque/briefing/2013/130625/LDM_BRI(2013)130625_REV1_EN.pdf)

³² FBI Glossary, disponibile a: <https://www.fbi.gov/about-us/investigate/organizedcrime/glossary>

³³ *The EU response to organised crime*, p.1.

Sicilian Region. What emerges from this study is that the Italian active youth-oriented citizenship policies and those specialized in fighting deviant phenomena are yet insufficient and should be improved. Not only economic and labor policies are necessary to make a real growth possible, but also specific actions concerning school and vocational training could be useful to contrast the NEET phenomenon, with important consequences in terms of juvenile deviance and crime.

The second chapter concerns the Albanian case. It explores in particular the causes of juvenile delinquency. The first part of the report is a brief history of organized crime in Albania – a recent phenomenon in comparison with other European countries – and of the limits of active citizenship policies. The second part focuses on juvenile delinquency and the complicated and slow process to harmonize the legal framework with the international standards. The author concludes his report proposing some recommendations to improve the situation of prevention of juvenile delinquency and showing some exemplar cases from real life.

The third chapter concerns Bulgaria. Within the general framework of the relationship between organized crime and juvenile delinquency, the authors focus on the analysis of best policies and practices on local, regional and national level. After presenting the current situation of organized and juvenile criminality in Bulgaria, the authors illustrate examples of best practices that see young people involved in networks of prevention and fight against organized and juvenile delinquency. The data analysed by the authors demonstrate the necessity of implementing measures that are more appropriate in order to prevent and combat criminality – as recommended by UE. When it comes to assessing the policies in the field of juvenile delinquency, even though it is a relatively new phenomenon, the authors identify different best practices. Less optimistic seem to be their forecast concerning the development of active citizenship, a concept which is lagging behind.

The fourth chapter focuses on the Croatian case. The author provides a brief history of organized crime in Croatia and of the evolution of the national legislation concerning the phenomenon, continues with analyzing the features of juvenile delinquency. The last part of the report concerns the ways in which civil society play a role in the fight against (organized) crime. Interviews with key witnesses conclude the chapter. An interesting element that arises is that in Croatia the civil society organizations are mainly concerned with corruption, considered as one of the main problems since the 90's.

The fifth chapter is dedicated to Czech case. The report provides an overview of organized crime and juvenile delinquency in the Czech Republic, and then continues with describing programs and strategies adopted in the fight against juvenile crime. As we have seen in the previous countries, the report considers that fight against juvenile crime is still a long-term process that should be put in relationship with the increasing unemployment and the dramatic reduction of “middle class”. Promising steps have been made in order to fight juvenile crime, in particular in the field of NGO sector.

The sixth chapter concerns the Estonian case. The report provides a synthetic overview of organized crime in Estonia and then describes the three categories that compose the legal prevention framework of organized crime in Estonia: legal acts of Republic of Estonia; strategic documents; documents of international law.

The seventh chapter describes the Greek peculiarities. The relationship between organized crime and juvenile delinquency is analyzed starting from statistical data on the current features of the two phenomena. In particular, the authors describe the socio-cultural background of young criminals, the legal tools to fight organized and juvenile crime and the programs and actions that link active citizenship and the prevention of juvenile crimes. The picture which emerges is fairly optimistic and positive, with criticisms focused exclusively on the adoption of excessively strict legal rules which end-up violating proportionality principles.

The eighth chapter focuses on Portugal. The author underlines the fact that, even though organized crime is not a constant threat for Portuguese people, it is a growing phenomenon that should be stopped by specific tools, in particular by the reorganization of the whole control system (police, courts etc.). The peculiarity of Portuguese case in terms of organized criminality is connected to its specific geostrategic position which makes it a turntable and European gateway for illicit affairs. The presence of specific projects aimed to promote youth active citizenship represents a decisive tool to preserve young people from embarking on crime.

The ninth chapter is dedicated to the Macedonian case. What emerges from the report is that the NGOs are strongly committed to promote and increase active citizenship, actions endorsed by the Government in the attempt to increase the level of compliance with EU standards. Still, according to the two authors, it seems that the law proposals are being made just looking at the formal European criteria instead of at their real implementation.

The tenth chapter focuses on the Romanian case. According to the authors, the peculiarity of the country is that the anti-state exists in the form of political and economic corruption. Even though there is not a specific legislation against this phenomenon, some specific institutions were created (in particular the DNA - Anti-Corruption General Directorate). However, the Romanian civil society seems to be passive and unstimulated for several reasons, among all the distrust in their possibility to fight the phenomenon and the perception of not being a direct target of this form of criminality. According to the authors an interesting stimulus to encourage civil society to become an active citizenry be represented is provided by education programs.

Their structure and modus operandi continually take new forms, rendering existing policy measures obsolete.

*

Although the meanings of citizenship, active citizenship and organized crime are still open to debate, the reports included in this volume consensually assess the culture of legality and the investments in social, economic and cultural programs for youth as a major defense for such a capillary phenomenon. There is also general agreement that EU programs for endorsing citizenship and active citizenship represent an effective tool for creating transnational networks of young people committed to EU values. Thus, they perceive the culture of legality as the best form of protection against arbitrary violence with references not only to a developed (and eventually harmonized) system of legal sanctions, but also to the fulfillment of individual and collective freedom.

Salvatore Di Piazza

Temporary Researcher at University of Palermo

Sorina Soare

Researcher at University of Florence