Italian Political Science

THE PROFESSIONAL REVIEW OF THE ITALIAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION

Co-Editors

Stefania Panebianco
Department of Political and Social Sciences
University of Catania, Italy
stefapnb@unict.it

Francesco Zucchini
Department of Social and Political Sciences
University of Milan, Italy
francesco.zucchini@unimi.it

Editorial Board

Marco Brunazzo
Department of Sociology and Social Research
University of Trento, Italy
marco.brunazzo@unitn.it

Carla Monteleone
Department of European Studies and
International Integration (DEMS)
University of Palermo, Italy
carla.monteleone01@unipa.it

Nicolò Conti
Department of Law and Economics
Unitelma Sapienza, Rome
nicolo.conti@unitelma.it

Manuela Moschella
Department of Cultures, Politics and Society
University of Turin, Italy
manuela.moschella@unito.it

IPS and **Italian Political Science** and all of the following contents are copyrighted by the **Società Italiana di Scienza Politica**.

Italian Political Science - IPS is the professional review of the **Italian Political Science Association** (Società Italiana di Scienza Politica). **IPS** is an academic journal registered with **ISSN 2420-8434** and published, since 2013, by the University of Catania (Catania, Italy) and the University of Milan (Milan, Italy). All issues from 2007 to 2012 were edited and published by the University of Siena (Siena, Italy).

ips
italian political science
THE PROFESSIONAL REVIEW OF THE ITALIAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION

Issue 11, Volume 1
June 2016

FOCUS ON

Outside Academia: Political Science as a Profession

Manuela Moschella, Stefania Panebianco and Francesco Zucchini
Editorial ... iii

*

POLITICAL SCIENTISTS AS CONSULTANTS AND ADVISORS

IPS interviews **Stefano Sacchi** ... 1
IPS interviews **David Natali** ... 7
IPS interviews **Marco Cacciotto** ... 10

POLITICAL SCIENTISTS AS POLITICIANS AND PUBLIC OFFICIALS

IPS interviews **Elisabetta Gualmini** ... 14
IPS interviews **Luca Martinelli** ... 17

Pierpaolo Settembri
Political Science and the Professions of Political Scientists: EU officials ... 22

POLITICAL SCIENTISTS AS RESEARCH AND TRAINING EXPERTS

IPS interviews **Angela Liberatore** ... 26

WHEN POLITICAL SCIENTISTS MEET EU NEGOTIATION AND NEGOTIATORS

IPS interviews **Francesco Marchi** ... 30

POLITICAL SCIENTISTS AS PUBLIC INTELLECTUALS

IPS interviews **Sofia Ventura** ... 35

Book Reviews

Section coordinated by Carla Monteleone and Stefania Panebianco

Giuseppe Gabusi *(University of Turin)*
Maurizio Carbone and Jan Orbie, *The Trade-Development Nexus in the European Union* ... 38

Andrea Carati *(University of Milan)*
Lorenzo Cladi and Andrea Locatelli (eds.), *International Relations Theory and European Security* ... 40

© 2015, Società Italiana di Scienza Politica
Italian Political Science
ISSN: 2420-8434

Marco Valigi *(University of Bologna)*
Fabrizio Coticchia and Francesco N. Moro
The Transformation of Italian Armed Forces in Comparative Perspective 42

Emidio Diodato *(Università per Stranieri di Perugia)*
Manlio Graziano, *Guerra santa e santa alleanza* 44

Francesca Longo *(University of Catania)*
Simona Piattoni, *The European Union* 46

Orazio Lanza *(University of Catania)*
Andrea Pritoni, *Poteri forti?* 48

Francesco Raniolo *(University of Calabria)*
Donatella M. Viola, *Routledge Handbook of European Elections* 50

Italian Political Science, VOLUME 11 ISSUE 1, JUNE 2016

ips

SISP SOCIETÀ ITALIANA DI SCIENZA POLITICA

FOCUS ON: Outside Academia: Political Science as a Profession

Manuela Moschella
Stefania Panebianco
Francesco Zucchini
EDITORIAL BOARD OF ITALIAN POLITICAL SCIENCE

It is not uncommon to hear descriptions of the academic profession as an activity that takes place in an ivory tower. Academics, so the argument runs, are too focused on scientific work, and not sufficiently willing to share and engage with wider audiences. This could be the case for Political Science, which in Italy seems to be confined to academia. **But this is not exactly true**.

This IPS issue takes this criticism head on by going outside the 'ivory tower' to explore Political Scientists' roles as managers, experts, consultants or public officials. **We have reached out to a number of scholars and practitioners who actively participate in the political and social world we study, either because they have public roles in it, or private careers**. Specifically, we asked IPS contributors to comment on two broad themes that pertain to the relationship between Political Science and the 'world out there'.

The first theme is the distinctive contributions that political scientists can make in public debate and political processes but also the reverse, i.e. the additional value of experiences as public official or consultant to academic work. What emerges from the interviews and contributions in this issue is a generally positive assessment of the public role of political scientists. On the one hand, our contributors largely agree that the mindset (and education) of political scientists provide us with the ability to foster a more informed public debate and more efficient policy solutions. "Academic engagement can shape the terms of public discourse, providing information, and analytical models" (**Cacciotto**). According to the IPS contributors, this ability stems from our holistic and complex understanding of how the political sphere works, our knowledge of its rules and processes, and our capacity to be flexible and adaptable. On the other hand, "political experience provides political scientists with enormous knowledge about the objects they study" (**Gualmini**). In general, "academics and practitioners complement and improve each other in their respective endeavours and, together, they do a better job" (**Settembri**).

The second major theme our contributors were invited to comment on is the question of the 'relevance' of our discipline when compared to others such as law and economics. In this respect, there is substantial variation in the contributions that follow. In general, virtually all the authors seem to agree that political scientists should reach out more regularly. At the same time, however, there is no consensus on whether such public outreach is the

© 2016 Italian Political Science. ISSN 2420-8434.
Volume 11, Issue 1, p. iii-v.

key to increased relevance, in terms of obtaining a hearing in public and political debates. **What emerges from the contributions is a widespread belief that political scientists are somehow marginalized in public debates and political decisions in our country**, especially when compared to lawyers and economists: "we find ourselves operating in a cultural tradition that attributes to lawyers pride of place in the management of 'cosa pubblica'." (**Ventura**); "economists have an advantage compared to political scientists: they simplify reality and give clear messages to policy-makers and stakeholders. Political scientists tend, by contrast, to make things complex and to give articulated and complex answers (**Natali**). This also applies in the EU institutions, though to a lesser extent. Nevertheless, " for political scientists it is maybe easier than for academics with other backgrounds (for example anthropology, linguistics or psychology) to pursue policy advice as well" (**Liberatore**). Furthermore, **it seems as if political scientists are reluctant to be vociferous in areas that clearly fall within the scope of their expertise, such as the area of public policy**. Given this state of affairs, "getting our hands dirty" does not automatically translate into increased relevance.

In addition to these broad themes, IPS contributors also discuss the risks that derive from going outside the ivory tower. One author finds that "by becoming a decision-maker (e.g., by engaging directly in politics or public administration), the scholar tends to lose social recognition as a source of independent knowledge, and therefore s/he loses an important power resource" (**Martinelli**). Even for those who are much more positively oriented towards the direct intervention of scholars in decision-making processes, there are dangers: "You are doing things that you, as a scholar, do not approve of, even if you understand the meaning and sometimes the utility in the political game (...) an anchorage to a value system must be present" (**Sacchi**). Of course, these risks are not confined to political scientists, but apply to all disciplines that move beyond their scientific circles. At any rate, in reflecting on the implications of public engagement for political scientists, the IPS contributors remind us all of the conflicting logics of academic research and policy-making. Whereas the former is much more long-term in orientation, and largely free of constraints, the latter is more short-term, and decisional constrains are part of a larger machine (whether this be domestic (parliamentary) decision-making or the bureaucratic politics of an EU institution). Furthermore, the sources of authority are significantly different, **as authority in academia is largely the result of scientific reputation, whereas in the 'real world' it largely depends on problem-solving ability**. Reconciling the two logics is possible but also extremely complicated: "it is a fragile balance between different priorities and ways of looking at politics" (**Natali**).

Finally, it is interesting to note that several of our contributors make suggestions for the (re)organization of our undergraduate and graduate degree courses. In particular, there is general agreement on the need for more practical knowledge, for more "testimonies" from policy-makers but also for broader knowledge (**Martinelli**). "In today's world, any political science curriculum should include activities, based on active pedagogy, that stimulate the problem-solving skills of students such as simulations, group projects, international exchanges and workshops with practitioners (**Marchi**). These suggestions tie in with the major issues discussed above; namely, the idea that political scientists' distinctive contribution to public life consists precisely in a mindset that is able to grasp complexity in the political and social world. Suggestions that we should tilt towards more

generalized knowledge and transversal skills, however, clash with the principle of specialization which has inspired much of the evolution of our discipline over the past two/three decades. **Whether to pursue one path or another, or how to combine them, provides further food for thought**. These issues – as highlighted by IPS contributors – represent a concern for all of us.

ips

Italian Political Science, VOLUME 11 ISSUE 1, JUNE 2016

SISP SOCIETÀ ITALIANA DI SCIENZA POLITICA

Political Scientists as Consultants and Advisors: Stefano Sacchi

Stefano Sacchi is an associate professor at the University of Milan and a non-resident research fellow at Collegio Carlo Alberto. He is a Comparative Political Economist, with a specific interest in the social and labor policies. Stefano holds a PhD in Political Science (University of Pavia) and a degree in economics (Bocconi University). He has been visiting scholar at UC Berkeley, Cornell, and the University of Washington. During the last two years he has worked as a policy advisor for the Italian government on social and labor policies, in particular the so-called Jobs Act, Renzi's Government reform of the labor market. Between November 2014 and December 2015 he was the chief policy advisor of the Labor Minister (Poletti) and in that capacity he designed, evaluated the financial impact and drafted the reform of unemployment benefits and short-time work (cassa integrazione). He also drafted chapters of the Budget Law for 2016, including those introducing a new minimum income scheme as well as active aging measures. Since January 2016 he has been the special commissioner of ISFOL, Italy's national research institute on social, labor, and vocational training policies, employing 600 workers, and overseen by the Labor Ministry. He was also appointed as an economic advisor to the Italian Prime Minister's Office.

IPS: Can you briefly describe your typical tasks and working day?

I have to distinguish the period when I was advisor of the Labor Minister from the current activity as special commissioner of ISFOL and advisor to the PM's Office. When I was at the Labor Ministry I used to go to the ministry, where I had an office, or to INPS (National Social Security Institute) where I met with the institute's statisticians for working out how to estimate the financial impact of the reforms I had planned, as well as discussing with those who manage and administer the social programs. I spent large portions of time, either in meetings or on the phone, discussing with the General Accounting Office, as well as ministerial legislative offices and chiefs of ministerial staff at the Labor ministry and the Treasury, on aspects concerning the policy content and design, as well as decision making. I met with representatives of the social partners and stakeholders on behalf of the Minister. I was also often in Parliament where I kept made contact with influential legislators, the Committee Chairs and the rapporteurs of the pieces of legislation I had drafted. In other words, I interacted with all actors who were involved in the decision making by moving between the ministry, Palazzo Chigi (namely the PM's office), INPS, and the Parliament. The working day started at six a.m. and was very long; it was during the very special period of the approvals, first of the Jobs Act, and then of the Stability Act (budgetary law).

With reference to the Jobs Act you should remember that it was a delegating law that provided a framework and bestowed upon the government the powers of enacting legislative decrees that, on their turn, required the compulsory opinion of the

© 2016 Italian Political Science. ISSN 2420-8434.
Volume 11, Issue 1, pp. 1–6.

parliamentary committees. Indeed, the opinions were often negotiated. We (government "actors") suggested in several cases that parliamentary committees should ask the government for clarifications or changes of aspects that we had not fully figured out when we introduced the draft pieces of legislation, or that it was politically more appropriate that the Parliament should ask and the government introduce in response.

The ISFOL typical day is very different. I work at my office between 8 am and 10 pm, then send emails and WhatsApp messages about next day's tasks with my general manager well into the night, as well as preparation for next day's meetings. I have much contact with other authorities, with the minister, the chief of ministerial staff, the PM's office. Personally or via my spokesman I establish relationships with the press, and I personally take care of relationships with the trade unions. A profound reorganization of ISFOL is taking place. It involves the transfer of some resources and staff to the new agency ANPAL; the introduction of a new statute and reinvigorating the Institute also through a new mission; new focused recruitments. These issues oblige me to very intense and continuous interactions with the general manager and the human resources manager and to keep in contact with other administrations such as, for example, the state general accounting office and the Ministry of Public Service. Sometimes, much less often than I would like I hold meetings with the researchers to steer the research carried out by ISFOL and to collect information on what they are already doing. Then there are the conferences in which I participate not only in my academic role, but also in my capacity as special commissioner of ISFOL. Finally, I participate both in the ISFOL delegation, and in the delegation of the ministry of labor, to meetings with representatives of international and supranational institutions (European Commission, OECD etc.) during their regular fact-finding missions. I also continue, but at a lower intensity, my work as advisor, now at the Prime Minister's office on pensions, income transfers, and social safety nets.

IPS: Are you happy with this mix of activities?

Now less than before. As a policy advisor I enjoyed my time a lot. I was at the heart of policymaking. The reform of unemployment benefits was a policy that I had planned for several years; implementing it was fulfilling a dream. The reform of short-time work (*cassa integrazione*) was much more difficult and I cannot yet believe we were able to achieve it. Being ISFOL Commissioner is not a fun job. It is a service that I fulfill, a duty. ISFOL is an agency that would have great potential but is held back by many problems. It is my mandate to overcome these problems and change it, but it is a lot of "dirty," tough work, including many unpleasant interactions: something between the work of a diplomat and that of a chief executive officer of a large company, with strained industrial relations. Being policy advisor of the PM's Office is still fun but it is a marginal activity compared to in the past. I am no longer at the heart of the policy process.

IPS: Is your job the result of a tenaciously pursued project, or rather of an opportunity you seized?

I leave it to the policy results to ascertain whether there is "*virtù*," but certainly there is a lot of "*fortuna*," to borrow from Machiavelli.

I was working for a while on a very informal basis with the Democratic Party. Above all, after the publication in 2009 of a book of mine on "flex-insecurity" that con-

tained concrete proposals about the labor market policies, the parliamentary group started inviting me to give presentations and seminars on labor and welfare policies. When Renzi, whom I did not know, became leader of the Democratic Party, he appointed a secretariat and he assigned the Labor department to Marianna Madia (current Minister of Public Service), whom I knew. Marianna asked me to prepare a reform of work-related income transfers (*ammortizzatori sociali*), as part of the more general reform of the labor market that Renzi had intended to provide to the Letta government as the Party's contribution, the so-called Jobs Act. I designed the reform, especially the reform of unemployment benefits, with the help also of research assistants in Collegio Carlo Alberto to assess its financial impact, while that of *cassa integrazione* was left at the level of general principles. When Renzi becomes prime minister, this reform enters the overall package of the labor market reform and will be introduced in parliament for approval of the delegation law. After a period abroad, as a visiting scholar at Cornell University, while the law is getting close to final adoption I am formally appointed by the Minister of Labor, Poletti, as his chief policy advisor.

Previously, during the Letta Government, I was a member of an advisory panel on the "minimum income scheme," with other (more senior) academics. Nevertheless, that experience has been overall marginal and it has not led to concrete results in policy terms.

In sum a new secretary of the ruling party who little later will become premier, brings with him to the secretariat and then to the PM's office a group of young people who in turn call peers they know, people who have researched and published on public policies in which they are interested, proposing reforms they are sympathetic with. Here the leaders of the group were Filippo Taddei at the Party and Tommaso Nannicini (now Undersecretary of State at the PM's Office) as the chief economic advisor to Renzi. We were seen as "barbarians" by high-ranked civil servants, brought by Renzi from academia into the public administration because he knew that with the administration's forces alone it would not be possible to produce the change he had in mind. A change that he figured out in general terms, while for crucial details he relied upon trustworthy experts.

IPS: Had you planned this type of career while you were studying because you were attracted by it, or rather is it the result of a later choice?

Honestly the possibility to carry out these tasks has not ever crossed my mind during my university training. But, nevertheless, I always thought that whoever studies social sciences wants to change the world, or more modestly to ameliorate the existing one. In my field, they want to affect public policies, and to improve them according to their system of values. In the public action the anchorage to a system of values is very important, as obviously you often have to come to big compromises. Having opportunities to intervene with concrete proposals in policymaking is perhaps easier for those who study public policies. But these opportunities are not entirely precluded also for other specialists, as for example the experts in electoral systems or in public administration or scholars who study the judicial systems. I truly believe that Political Science can be very useful for policymaking. Following Lindblom and Cohen, you can provide "usable knowledge" to improve policies.

IPS: Did studying Political Science matter?

I think it mattered. Unfortunately, those of us (political scientists) involved in policymaking are very, very few. Political science is an empirical science that inspires the taste for the knowledge of processes, the knowledge of "how" things take place. This is an advantage over, for example, economists and lawyers. We are on one hand more aware of the constraints on the action and on the other hand we focus more on the real consequences of policies and not on what is desirable in an ideal world or on what "logically" should come down from the institutional design. The majority of academics involved in policymaking are economists who, during policymaking, realize what we as political scientists know before the process starts: the reality is much more complicated than the models.

We suffer, particularly compared to the economists of a reputational disadvantage, not so much with civil servants in the public administration but with other actors in the policy networks. They are in fact mostly economists, and the economists tend, at least initially, only to consider other economists. Afterwards, sometimes, they change their minds. Ultimately, it is their problem.

IPS: Is there anything not written in textbooks that you have learned thanks to your work experience, and that you would recommend should be taught to politics and policy students?

In fact, I did not learn new things in general terms, but I have observed at first hand the strength of some descriptions and explanations that are already well known among scholars. First, the very limited rationality of policy processes. Sometimes they are really the "garbage can" type; often they are incremental. In all cases, to borrow from Krasner, policy processes are "non-ergodic": random events may lead the decision making toward unwanted and costly paths that are very difficult to abandon and reverse, no matter how many good arguments and empirical evidence you can show.

Often the policy actors have little time, they do not have sufficient knowledge, they have a busy schedule and they want to consider as addressed and resolved as many issues as possible, as soon as possible, even if they are not. Moreover, even when you can resort to authority resources, of course I do not speak of my own authority, when for example you may appeal directly to the support of a prime minister, it is very hard to shake a recently reached equilibrium, even if such an equilibrium is a bad equilibrium.

A connected aspect, that Heclo mentioned and I found crucial, is the importance of presiding over all meetings. If you are not present, then decisions you dislike may be made and it is very difficult to change them later. Not only the physical presence but also mental brightness is important, and after several long, exhausting meetings in a single day you cannot take it for granted. Moreover, you have to know very well the files, the details of what you are discussing, to be able to lead the discussion in the preferred direction from the beginning, with arguments that are convincing both with respect to the policy goals and with regard to the political convenience of the actors who are involved in the decision-making process. You have to show the ultimate decision makers that the losers are few and the winners are many, and that they can explain this to the public opinion in simple and effective terms.

IPS: Can you identify who has an academic background similar to yours on the basis of their approach to problem setting and problem solving? Or rather do you think that other differences/similarities (e.g., personality, political orientation, other peculiarities) matter more than academic background?

I did not interact with other political scientists. However, I interacted with some economists with keen sensitivity for political science and the reciprocal understanding was immediate and profitable. Then of course also other aspects matter as, for example, being from the same generation and living a very similar experience, understanding that this was a unique opportunity to introduce long-awaited reforms.

IPS: How would you re-organize (if needed) courses in political science (including its sub-disciplines) in order to structure a curriculum that could naturally lead to your current job?

I think policy actors should be more often involved to provide testimonies of the strategies, the efforts and the tools that they use to push through a policy decision. At the same time these testimonies should always be filtered by instructors who subsume the first hand information under an analytical framework. There is always the risk of over-involvement, even when you are a scholar as I am. Currently I do suffer from over-involvement—sometimes I am not sufficiently detached from the flow of processes and every policy detail seems to me important.

In particular, for master and PhD students, internships at institutions (Parliament, the PM's office, ministries) would be very useful for realizing how and when decisions occur.

IPS: Should Political Science scholars "get their hands dirty," i.e., intervene more in politics and policy making, so that they gain in relevance?

It is a choice to be left to the individual scholar and to their inclinations. As I said before, for me to be a social scientist means not only describing and understanding phenomena but also using this knowledge to intervene. But I do not want to impose this view on other social scientists.

IPS: As far as your activity domain is concerned, is it possible and necessary to distinguish between technical knowledge on the one hand, and political values and policy preferences on the other?

I do not believe it is possible, let alone necessary. That said, often in politics you do things you do not approve of. I sometimes found myself helping, even drafting provisions on which I disagreed. I did not want them designed that way, or I did not want them at all. It is part of the "getting your hands dirty with politics." You are doing things that you, as scholar, do not approve of even if you understand the meaning and sometimes the utility in the political game. However, an anchorage to a value system must be present. Otherwise it is only sheer cynicism, action that pursues short-term benefits, the thrill of victory over the opponent, devoid of any value content.

IPS: Did you find it easier to research or to be policy advisor? And why?

Now I appreciate research activity even more. It is certainly tiring, at least for me. It usually takes me a long time before starting writing, in the preliminary phase when

I organize the evidence I collected and build the argument, then I am very quick at actual writing, but it all takes time and focus and now I lack both. Still, now, when I manage to have a couple days in a row to get back to some unfinished matters and papers, I confess that I am even happier than I was before. The job as policy advisor, under the conditions in which I play this role, is pure adrenaline. Participating in the decision-making process that lead to the Stability Act was an extreme experience—exhausting but also exciting. Everything happens very quickly and you have to be there. I was in the office into the night and early morning, I was consulted while decisions were being taken at the highest level. The risk is that this sort of inebriation takes over, a frequent phenomenon among politicians, and that the effects and nature of the provisions you carry through, the policy contents, matter less, and less compared to winning political battles. It is the kind of cynicism I mentioned above. You can defeat it by preserving a framework of values that allows you to put in the right perspective what you do, what you can do and what it is appropriate to reach or to oppose.

IPS: Did you have the opportunity to compare your experience with that of other academic experts, political scientists from other European countries in a condition similar to yours? Do you think the policy process and your role, for example, during the approval of the Italian Stability Act, are also detectable in other European experiences?

I have not had yet the chance to meet other similar experts from other countries. Let me say that my experience as a consultant has been very peculiar. I found myself imposed on the administration by a prime minister who wanted to make changes. He was aware that those changes would not have come if he had relied upon that structure. It is hard to repeat such an experience. Indeed, the ministerial administrations are taking up the leeway, the room for maneuver they had initially lost. Perhaps the role that I played in those days would no longer be possible.

ips

Italian Political Science, Volume 11 Issue 1, June 2016

SISP Società Italiana di Scienza Politica

Political Scientists as Consultants and Advisors: David Natali

David Natali is an Associate Professor at the University of Bologna at Forlì. He holds a PhD in political science from the European University Institute of Florence (EUI, 2002). The specific focus of his research is the comparative analysis of pensions, the EU coordination of social protection and social inclusion policy, the Lisbon Strategy and the Europe 2020 Strategy. He is also working on social concertation and social dialog in broader terms, across Europe. He has been involved in several European integrated projects and networks of excellence financed through the 6th and 7th Framework Programmes (including NEUJOBS, NEWGOV, INTUNE, RECWOWE). He coordinated several research projects on pensions and the EU social dimension and the comparative analysis of pension reforms.

IPS: Can you briefly describe your typical tasks and working day? Are you happy in your current job?

Academic life is complex and in fact consists of many different activities. Rather than in an ivory tower, scholars are increasingly involved in many respects in political life. Applied research is one of these respects, as well as the collaboration with policymakers at different levels. While teaching and research are the main part of my daily life, I am involved in the reflection group on EU governance of the Italian Presidency of the Council (headed by the secretary of State for European Affairs, Sandro Gozi). On top of that, I am involved in the European Social Policy Network (ESPN), the set of experts of social policy that support the European Commission in monitoring and assessing welfare reforms across the EU and in other projects supported by EU stakeholders.

IPS: Is your job the result of a tenaciously pursued project, or rather of an opportunity you seized? Had you planned this type of career whilst you were studying because you were attracted by it, or rather is it the result of a later choice? Did studying Political Science matter?

My professional life has been quite peculiar. After my PhD at the European University Institute of Florence, I left Italy and worked in Brussels for an independent research institute. I thus left academic institutions to be fully involved in the network of policy analysts based in Brussels. I worked for the European Social Observatory in a project financed by the Belgian Government in the field of pensions to analyze the first results of the new EU mode of coordination in the area: the Open Method of Coordination. At that time, I lived through a big shift: from an academic expert on comparative politics, I turned to comparative policy analysis and I started approaching EU integration studies. The methodological, analytical and theoretical background I got during the PhD program was crucial in my decision to start working in new fields and through different analytical if not disciplinary

© 2016 Italian Political Science. ISSN 2420-8434.
Volume 11, Issue 1, pp. 7–9.

lenses. Even after my return to academia, I have continued trying to find a shared ground between more academic research on one hand, and applied research on other.

IPS: People you work with often have a different educational background to you. What are the competing academic backgrounds in your working environment? Do you perceive you have an advantage or disadvantage vis-à-vis these colleagues? What does such advantage or disadvantage consist of?

Those who are involved in policymaking have very different backgrounds. Between analysts, for instance, economists have a leading role. To some extent they have monopolized the activity of knowledge-diffusion. They have an advantage compared to political scientists: they simplify reality and give clear messages to policymakers and stakeholders. Political scientists tend, by contrast, to make things complex and to give articulated and complex answers.

IPS: Is there anything not written in textbooks that you have learned thanks to your work experience, and that you would recommend should be taught to politics and policy students?

Policymaking is not a purely rational activity. Many factors that shape the way policymakers interpret problems and solutions are imponderable and do not reflect a "synoptic rationality." That said, I have found my own background—policy analysis, policy studies, etc.—extremely useful and able to provide the right analytical toolkit to understand politics.

IPS: Can you identify who has an academic background similar to yours on the basis of their approach to problem setting and problem solving? Or rather do you think that other differences or similarities (e.g., personality, political orientation, other peculiarities) matter more than academic background?

As stressed above, a key cleavage is between economists on the one hand and the other social scientists on the other. The latter tend to share similar methods and analytical frameworks. But personal profiles are extremely important too. Analysts tend to show different styles and attitudes irrespective of their scientific background.

IPS: How would you re-organize (if needed) courses in political science (including its sub-disciplines) in order to structure a curriculum that could naturally lead to activities as the policy advisor?

Political studies have experienced a huge transformation in recent years. The academic track—with doctoral studies followed by fellowships, and more stable contracts—is increasingly "contaminated" with more policy-oriented research for policy-makers and/or stakeholders. This is a promising aspect that needs to be cultivated with an on-going dialog between universities and institutions involved in the policymaking process. Recent attempts to open academic institutions with seminars, roundtables, internships and joint research projects with non-academic institutions are very promising in that sense. At the same time, some risks are evident: academic research risks passively accepting the policy-makers' agenda both in terms of topics and analytical and theoretical frameworks.

IPS: Should political science scholars "get their hands dirty," i.e., intervene more in politics and policy making, so that they gain in relevance? As far as your activity domain is concerned, is it possible to distinguish easily between technical knowledge on the one hand, and political values and policy preferences on the other?

Some dialog—if not interference between politics, policymaking and political studies—has always been evident. If we look back at the origin of political studies, for instance, it is clear that the dialog with policymakers enriches scientific knowledge. This is potentially beneficial for the two sides: for the analysts this allows for an immediate feedback to their theories and frameworks, while for policymakers and practitioners, political scientists, it allows for a sense of reality. But this is a fragile balance between different priorities and ways to look at politics.

IPS: For a political science scholar who wants to be active and produce an impact on policy making, is it easier to do it by studying the policy process or rather by being fully part of the process as decision maker?

o be honest, I think all political scientists aspire to being somehow involved in politics and policymaking. First, this is the result of intellectual curiosity. They want to be close to the political life to improve their own knowledge of political dynamics. Yet different scholars may have different ambitions: some may want to prescribe some decisions or courses of policies, while others feel the risk of being involved in what they study.

IPS: What is the added value of the political science scholar to the job of policy practitioner?

Policymakers and stakeholders tend to focus on the short term: they need solutions to address major problems. They need these solutions to be consistent with their own interests and ideological backgrounds. But they do not have time for an in depth analysis of both problems and solutions and the link between the two, so they need scholars and experts to shed light both on problems and solutions with a longer-term view.

IPS: And, vice versa, how is the profession of policy practitioner improving the academic work?

Academics tend to be concentrated on theories and analytical concepts and grids. They often risk being at the margin of political and social life, in an ivory tower. They thus need to have a dialog with those who live the day-by-day political and socio-economic dynamics. It is crucial to have a feedback about theories and analytical framework and to have direct access to empirical information.

IPS: What are the disadvantages of mixing up theoretical knowledge and "practice"?

The major risk is to be trapped in a purely ideological discourse set by practitioners and to lack the necessary autonomy to analyze the evidence of politics with a sound method. What is more, the world of politics and that of science are partly inconsistent. I refer to the different approaches they follow, for instance in terms of time frame. The time perspective of scholars is long and slow. They need time for in depth analyses. By contrast, policymaking is rapid and need fast solutions. It is thus hard to strike a deal between these two different time frames. Sometimes the analyst basically cannot provide the knowledge policymakers demand and should thus resist from giving inaccurate inputs.

Italian Political Science, VOLUME 11 ISSUE 1, JUNE 2016

Political Scientists as Consultants and Advisors: Marco Cacciotto

Marco Cacciotto is 47 years old and a political consultant since 1996, one of the first in Italy, giving strategic advice to parties, candidates, public administrations, interest groups and labor unions. He graduated in Political Sciences at the University of Milan, with a thesis on the presidential election campaigns in the United States. He wrote a handbook on political marketing in 2011 for the Il Mulino publishing company. He teaches "Political marketing and public affairs" in the post graduate program in "Public and corporate communication" of the University of Milan and he is a board member of the IAPC (International Association of Political Consultants) and the EAPC (European Association of Political Consultants). He is also a founder of ***Public****, a network of professionals and firms specialized in public interest strategies, communication, and research.*

IPS: Can you briefly describe your typical tasks and working day? Are you happy in your current job?

There is not a typical day and no fixed hours. I spend a lot of time on the phone and in meetings. During campaigns I usually travel a lot because I advise more than one campaign at the same time (an average of four or five, my "record" is 12 campaigns being run simultaneously in 2014). I'm quite happy, but in the last two years I have worked less on electoral campaigns and moved toward grassroots campaigning and applying my experience to corporate needs.

Political consulting is a relatively new profession that evolves and redefines itself at every electoral cycle. The birth and definition of the modern political consultant are strictly linked to the transformations produced by radio, cinema, and particularly, television. Today, we are seeing yet a new transformation with the rising importance of the Internet and digital technologies, the wide use of political marketing (and analytic measuring systems), and with new and advanced techniques of segmentation and micro targeting of the constituency. There are several factors that represent significant challenges for the political consulting industry in the years to come, and which could bring the profession to be redefined, once again: momentous technological advances; the extending of campaigning in public affairs and policy consulting; more services and clients from the private industry as an extension of voter/consumer segmentation and innovative approaches developed for political campaigns; the increasing need for continuous campaigning (which usually results in either a long-term and stable work relationship with the elected candidate or a temporary "settling" in institutions until the next electoral campaign).

© 2016 Italian Political Science. ISSN 2420-8434.
Volume 11, Issue 1, pp. 10–13.

IPS: Is your job the result of a tenaciously pursued project, or rather of an opportunity you seized? Had you planned this type of career whilst you were studying because you were attracted by it, or rather is it the result of a later choice? Did studying Political Science matter?

Yes, it was my dream and my goal. I discovered the political consultant role while I was writing my thesis dissertation on "the role of the media in US presidential campaigns from 1952 to 1996." I bet on a profession that was not present in Italy and a lot of people in the communication sector tried to discourage me, by saying that it was an American job and it would never work in Italy. I graduated in political sciences with the "political science" professor because there was not a political communication teaching block during those years. Now I teach "political marketing," which has been defined as a marriage between marketing and political science. Political marketing is created by applying marketing concepts from business to politics, but not by simply imposing one over the other. I believe that studying political science is fundamental for everyone that is willing to become a political consultant.

IPS: People you work with often have a different educational background to you. What are the competing academic backgrounds in your working environment? Do you perceive you have an advantage or disadvantage vis-à-vis these colleagues? What does such advantage or disadvantage consist of?

Political campaigning is an art, but a scientific approach is needed. My advantage consists in being not just an expert in communications or marketing: I know political rules, and I know how the political system has developed and works. You cannot prepare an effective campaign if you do not know laws on political procedures that shape campaigns and the political market.

IPS: Is there anything not written in textbooks that you have learned thanks to your work experience, and that you would recommend should be taught to politics and policy students?

Political consultants measure public opinion, target and identify likely voters, craft messages and strategies, design television and print advertisements, build websites, and decide how to adapt the overall theme and strategy of the campaign for the digital media formats. Books are often theoric and for scientific purposes divide in clear and subsequent stages the preparation and the running of a campaign. Reality is more chaotic and less predictable; it is possible to learn only through practice and experience to govern a dynamic environment.

IPS: How would you re-organize (if needed) courses in Political Science (including its sub-disciplines) in order to structure a curriculum that could naturally lead to your current job?

Politics have entered the "fast" era of communication, like companies did before: 24-hour news cycles; fast diffusion of messages; media used for engaging citizens, as well as sending messages; personalized communication; segmentation of voters by lifestyles with the use of databases and measuring systems that are ever more sophisticated. Data-driven politics is changing the way parties and candidates are campaigning, requiring new skills for political consultants. The Obama 2012 campaign recruited some of the best young minds in the booming fields of analytics and behavioral science and placed them in a room they called "the Cave" for up to 16

hours a day over the course of roughly 16 months. They developed a host of highly effective marketing techniques that were either entirely new or had never been tried on such a grand scale. Social strategists and data analytics experts become a fundamental part of campaigns that aimed to tailor message and activities to a particular person's interest through the use of digital information and computer algorithms. Political Sciences classes should reflect those changes, teaching, for instance, data analytics, but at the same time give an overall view on marketing, political institutions and the electoral system. Students should know how the parliament operates, how legislative procedures shape outcomes, and how entities like the executive, lobbyists, and organized citizens influence the work of the legislature. How can you be a strategist if you do not know the impact of a different electoral law on political supply, the limitations to campaigning that comes from laws on political communications?

IPS: Should political science scholars "get their hands dirty," i.e., intervene more in politics and policy making, so that they gain in relevance? As far as your activity domain is concerned, is it possible to distinguish easily between technical knowledge on the one hand, and political values and policy preferences on the other?

Yes, I think that political scientists should be more involved. In 2012 Nate Silver set off a modest paradigm shift in political journalism and brought the rules of political science to Beltway journalism. His blog "FiveThirtyEight"—which was acquired by ESPN in 2013—quickly attracted imitators and competitors. Mr. Klein started *Vox*, the *New York Times* established a new quantitatively minded section, called "The Upshot," and the *Washington Post* annexed a blog, called "The Monkey Cage," dedicated to political science. What was once Mr. Silver's lonely crusade soon became an echo chamber. Although these sites occasionally conducted their own statistical studies, they mostly relied on existing academic work, giving political scientists an audience of unprecedented scale. The Monkey Cage blog on the Washington Post website has published more than 8000 articles, featuring nearly 1.500 political scientists. Academic engagement can shape the terms of public discourse, providing information, and analytical models.

IPS: For a political science scholar who wants to be active and produce an impact on policy making, is it easier to do it by studying the policy process or rather by being fully part of the process as decision maker?

It is better to do it by studying the political process, otherwise the risk is that you will become part of the game. A political scientist should be independent and not become a pundit. Once, at an international conference of political consultants, they asked me, "do you prefer be introduced as a professor or as a consultant?" I answered "You can say that I'm a consultant when I win elections and a professor when I lose." They still remember the joke.

In Italy being a professor is often an advantage when you talk to a journalists or a potential client because you are perceived as more authoritative, but it can become a risk to be perceived as someone that is not practical, out of touch with reality. There is a gap that must be voided.

IPS: What is the added value of the political science scholar to the job of policy practitioner?

I think that political scientists should defend the need for a quality work. If I think of polling, I saw so many polls that were conducted in a bad way using small samples to draw conclusions and estimates electoral outcomes. Public polls are used as a political communication tool but the result is becoming the perception that all the polls are bad and not reliable. Now the trend is doing research online and using data from social networks but some outputs are really not scientific.

Political scientists should help political professionals that need accurate data if they want to prepare the best strategy to win. If you start a campaign with a wrong map your road to victory could be long or without an end.

Analytical tools and the measurement of every single aspect of a campaign is the latest trend coming from the USA: Jim Messina, Obama's former campaign manager that now is working also for Renzi, represents a new generation of consultants that are fond of metrics. Messina is convinced that modern presidential campaigns, unlike what is found in history books, are comparable to fast-growing technology companies, and the presidential job position is like that of the company executives. Big data allows campaign executives and strategists to measure and therefore manage campaigns more precisely than ever before.

Political scientists can help to measure the effectiveness of communication activities and help strategists and politicians to make decisions based on numbers and not only on intuition. Data-driven politics is changing the way parties and candidates are campaigning, requiring new skills for political consultants and represents a huge opportunity for political scientists.

IPS: And, vice versa, how is the profession of policy practitioner improving the academic work?

I started to work in 1996 and to teach at a university in 2005. My first approach with political communication models and studies of electoral campaigns has been not easy. Often I thought that academic models and a lot of assumptions were not correct because reality was quite different. I think that is very important that a scientific approach must be tested on the ground. When I developed the CDA approach to campaigns, my work started from my practical experience: I had the opportunity to test it on several campaigns and make it better year after year. In the last ten years a lot of things have changed and in my field political marketing studies and models have played an important role.

ips

Italian Political Science, VOLUME 11 ISSUE 1, JUNE 2016

SISP SOCIETÀ ITALIANA DI SCIENZA POLITICA

Political Scientists as Politicians and Public Officials: Elisabetta Gualmini

Elisabetta Gualmini is a Full Professor of Political Science at the University of Bologna. She holds a Phd in Political Science (University of Florence) and has been visiting scholar at the WZB in Berlin, the Humboldt Universitat in Berlin, the London School of Economics, the UC Berkeley and the UC Los Angeles. Between 2011 and 2014 she was the President of the Istituto Carlo Cattaneo. She has written almost 10 monographies in the filed of labour policies and comparative public administration and more than 30 essays. In 2015 she has been appointed Vice-President of the Emilia Romagna Regional Government, so she is temporarily on a leave from the University.

IPS: Can you give us a glimpse into a typical work day of yours?

Well, my day starts quite early as I have go through the national and local press and help my children get ready for school. After that, I usually arrive at my office around 9.30 am where I hold regular meetings with several stakeholders in social and housing policies, trade unions, associations, mayors, and other public administrators. My agenda also includes formal political meetings, for example with the regional legislative assembly. Once day per week I organize meetings outside Bologna to meet with local stakeholders and policymakers, in order to explain what we do at the regional level and get feedback on how to improve our legislative activity. Let me add that many meetings—the crucial ones—are usually scheduled late in the evening. Not exactly an easy situation for a woman who is also a mother. A bad habit, unfortunately widespread not only in political activity.

IPS: Reflecting on the process that led you to hold a critical position for the public administration of the Regione Emilia-Romagna, would you characterize such an outcome as the result of fortuitous circumstances or something that you deliberately chose to do?

Well, I never ruled out working in public administration. Actually, I have always thought I would like that. At the same time, I think it is not possible to think of a political career as a long-term one. Hence, I am grateful to my academic job as it offers me the chance of gaining an extraordinary first-hand experience of a world I have always studied.

As for my current position, this is an opportunity that opened up suddenly. At the beginning I was left wondering whether to accept the offer, because I wanted to conclude my term at the Istituto Cattaneo. I ultimately decided to give it try when I was offered the vice-president position: a position that offers me the possibility to oversee all public policies that are formulated at the regional level.

© 2016 Italian Political Science. ISSN 2420-8434.
Volume 11, Issue 1, pp. 14–16.

IPS: As a political scientist and a scholar of public policy, what do you conceive as the most important contributions that our profession brings to the political table?

I think we bring significant contributions. Let me offer a couple of examples based on my recent experience at the Regione. In my experience, knowing about how public policies are formulated and adopted, as well as their implementation, has certainly been a useful tool and a personal contribution to the political processes I participate in. Furthermore, our skills to collect evidence, organize and present arguments is important for engaging public audiences. Our theoretical background allows us to make connections among seemingly different issues and is a skill that citizens appreciate. I think voters have become more demanding and are no longer satisfied with slogans: they look for serious interlocutors and political scientists can provide citizens with insights on the political and social reality of our time.

In spite of all the potential advantages that stem from our professional activity, we should also be aware of the risks. Specifically, people that come from academia can often be perceived as too theoretical and thus detached from reality. As a result, I think it is important to maintain a pragmatic approach to politics even if we rely on our theoretical and methodological toolkit. In other words, we should remember that our knowledge is not written in stone, but that pragmatism is required to reach those compromises at the heart of political decisions.

IPS: Keeping with the theme regarding the two-way relationship between academic work and political engagement, in what respects does public involvement improve academic work and how?

Political experience provides political scientists with enormous knowledge about the objects they study. To start with, and again based on my experience, active involvement means getting a hand on the veto powers and points that hinder the working of public administrations, stifling ideas and innovation. Still, this experience provides practical knowledge of how to solve problems that citizens care about. I think that it will be useful to go back to an academic class and tell students about the changes in the social-economic fabric of our country that I am presiding over in my role. Over the past few years, the social system we used to know has significantly been transformed as the categories of wealth and poverty have changed, with enormous consequences for how to formulate social policies. Again, however, caution is needed. What I mean is that moving back from the political arena to academia requires leaving aside all the ideologies that characterize the former setting.

IPS: What is your take on the relevance of political scientists to the public and political debate? Do you think that public engagement is a recipe for relevance or not?

I think that there is nothing wrong with political scientists becoming actively engaged in politics. We can provide some important value by sharing our knowledge and passion with the political communities we live in. Furthermore, as we have the luxury (and I think it really is so) to take a sabbatical from our profession to participate in political life, we can still preserve the boundary that separates the academic work from the political one. But let me reiterate that I think it is important for political scientists to make their voices heard, especially at a time when we are going through historical socio-economic changes.

IPS: But are our voices heard? Or are those of colleagues from other disciplines "more heard" than ours?

Well, I think it is fair to say that political scientists are not generally given pride of place in political debates and decisions in Italy, especially as compared to lawyers and economists. When institutional reforms are on the political agenda, policy-makers tend to rely on legal scholars rather than on political scientists. In general, there is a widespread interpretation of political scientists as scholars working almost exclusively on electoral systems or public opinion analyses. And this, of course, does not give justice to our discipline. Furthermore, if we think of the range of policies that policymakers deal with, then political scientists have certainly more to say than legal scholars.

ips

Italian Political Science, VOLUME 11 ISSUE 1, JUNE 2016

SISP SOCIETÀ ITALIANA DI SCIENZA POLITICA

Political Scientists as Politicians and Public Officials: Luca Martinelli

Luca Martinelli is an official of the European Commission. After completing his PhD in Political Science in the University of Florence in 1995, he undertook research at the University of Bologna (Centre for Public Policy Analysis in the Department of Organization and Political System), on projects related to public administration and public policy analysis. In 1997 he joined the European Commission, working first in Public Health Policy and then (since 2001) in Information Society and Media. He then worked as Policy Officer for Digital Libraries, Open Data, and Public Sector Information within the Information Society and Media Directorate General, before taking up his current role as the Assistant to the Director General of the Publications Office of the European Union in late 2012. His experience as researcher and policy practitioner ranges across issues as diverse as environment, transport, public health, broadcasting, ICT research and deployment. His current research interests focus on the policies defined by the Digital Agenda for Europe (DAE), the Commission strategy to deliver social and economic benefits through ICT.

IPS: Can you briefly describe your typical tasks and working day? Are you happy in your current job?

I have been working as Assistant to the Director-General of the Publications Office of the European Union since 2012. This is a position closely associated with the operational management of an organisation of about 600 staff and with an overall budget of € 130 million. Our mission is to produce, to publish and to provide access to the publications and official information (e.g. legislation) of the European Union institutions. These tasks are rapidly changing in the context of the digital revolution, and more and more of the services that we provide are web-based and paperless: for example, since 2013 only the online edition of the Official Journal of the EU is authentic and has legal value. Within the Commission, DG Assistants (often referred to as “Policy Assistants”) are a typical “staff function” charged to support and advise the Director-General on any possible matter. My daily tasks therefore include taking part in management and senior management activities and strategic discussions, both internally and at interinstitutional level. The Publications Office is governed by a Management Board where all EU institutions (Commission, Council, Parliament, Court of Justice, etc.) are represented at the level of Secretary General. Strategic orientation, as well as management and negotiation skills are important in my job. Although the mission of the organisation is clear and well defined, the political, institutional and technological environment in which we operate is changing rapidly and is often uncertain. This makes my current job both challenging and very interesting, and I can definitely say I am happy to work for the EU citizens in this position.

© 2016 Italian Political Science. ISSN 2420-8434.
Volume 11, Issue 1, pp. 17–21.

IPS: Is your job the result of a tenaciously pursued project, or rather of an opportunity you seized? Had you planned this type of career whilst you were studying because you were attracted by it, or rather is it the result of a later choice? Did studying Political Science matter?

I started studying Political Science at the University of Bologna in 1985 with the idea of becoming a journalist. Coming from the *Liceo Classico*, I was fascinated by the concept of "polis", the public good, and I liked writing. While studying, I progressively enlarged my range of future professional options. What interested me was the political phenomenon, in particular its policy and public administration dimensions, which could be approached from different professional angles. While working for my PhD I had, of course, also considered the possibility of an academic career. In the mid-90s the chances of a research position in an Italian University were rather poor, unless one was ready to accept scholarships and temporary positions which could last for many years.

After completing my doctorate in 1995 I therefore applied for, and succeeded in, competitions for posts in public service organisations both in Italy and at European level. My first postdoc job was at the Council of the Autonomous Province of Trento, the legislative assembly in my region of origin. I was the official responsible for one of the permanent legislative committees (Environment and Land Planning) and for a special inquiry committee. Although rather short (I worked there for less than two years), this was an enriching and very interesting experience, as one could really observe a "micro" political system in action. In 1997 I was then hired by the European Commission, as a policy officer at the Public Health Directorate in Luxembourg. Since then I have changed job and department every 5 years on average within the Commission.

Internal mobility is highly supported as part of the human resources policy for management and sensitive functions. My academic background was instrumental in allowing me such changes of policy area. After public health, I worked as an evaluation officer in the context of the research framework programmes, and then again as policy officer in the area of the digital agenda for Europe (access to cultural and scientific information; public sector information; open data), until I was offered my present position in 2012. Having a background in Political Science has been really important, both in terms of providing a successful "knowledge key" for my initial recruitment and also for facilitating my move to different positions throughout my career.

IPS: People you work with often have a different educational background. What are the competing academic backgrounds in your working environment? Do you perceive you have an advantage/disadvantage vis-à-vis these colleagues? What does such advantage/disadvantage consist of?

The academic background of the administrator-grade employees of the European Commission is very diverse. Besides those with a qualification in Political Science, there are also lawyers, economists and linguists. There are also many other specialised profiles, such as engineers and Information Technology specialists, which I have particularly encountered both in my present job at the Publications Office and in my previous job at the Information Society and Media Directorate General (now DG CONNECT). A considerable number of my colleagues at the Public Health Directorate (my first appointment), were medical doctors, epidemiologists and public health specialists. Although I am not particularly keen on the distinction between

"generalists" and "specialists", I would place myself in the former group – although I like to consider myself as a specialist in public administration. Moreover, I believe a key feature of a performing administration is to strike the right mix between the different types of competence required. As regards the advantages that a background in Political Science brings, I would mention: understanding the general context, complexity analysis, flexibility and adaptability. One disadvantage is perhaps the dependence from domain-specific knowledge.

IPS: Is there anything not written in textbooks that you have learned thanks to your work experience, and that you would recommend should be taught to politics and policy students?

I had a comprehensive exposure to and understanding of empirical approaches to politics, society and organisations before I started work within the sphere of public administration. I was therefore quite familiar with concepts like unexpected consequence, perverse result, organised anarchy, implementation gap, etc. The perception of a hiatus between what is taught in books and the reality experienced when working is probably more obvious for a law student. The only recommendation I have would be to encourage traineeships for master level students, so that they get exposed the reality they study at an earlier stage.

IPS: Can you identify who has an academic background similar to yours on the basis of his/her approach to problem setting and problem solving? Or rather do you think that other differences/similarities (e.g. personality, political orientation, other peculiarities) matter more than academic background?

In my experience, I would say that "education matters" particularly in the way problems are set, conceptualised and analysed. However, I have doubts that academic background can be a predictor of the type of solutions that are proposed to a given problem. Probably other factors play a more important role in this, for example being more or less creative and innovative. My experience at the Commission concerns rather technical policy domains, and I can say that political orientation does not appear to me as an important variable to explain the approach to problems. The most relevant factor is probably the mix of competences that are brought to the game, as problem solving at Commission always stresses interdisciplinary approaches and team work.

IPS: How would you re-organize (if needed) courses in Political Science (including its sub-disciplines) in order to structure a curriculum that could naturally lead to your current job?

In my opinion, the undergraduate and graduate courses which fall under the general grouping of Political Science disciplines that are offered by Italian universities are incredibly rich and diversified. The situation has changed dramatically since the second half of the 1980s, when I took my old "Laurea". At the time, the offer was rather simple: five specialisations were possible after the first year common core: sociology, history, economics, international relations and public administration. At PhD level, we normally referred to three sub-disciplines: 1) political theory/political system; 2) international relations; 3) public administrations/public policy. I chose the last area both for the Laurea and the Doctorate.

I do not have sufficient knowledge about the results of the Italian university reform process to formulate any specific recommendations as to how it should be reorgan-

ised. I believe the process of diversification of the offer is probably irreversible, but in general terms I tend to have reservations about excessively specialised approaches at first degree level.

I am personally in favour of a solid, common and interdisciplinary academic basis at first degree level, followed by more specialised and profession-oriented master level. A master level degree that could have naturally prepared me for my career at the Commission might have been labelled "European institutions and policies" or "European administrative studies".

IPS: Should Political Science scholars "get their hands dirty", i.e. intervene more in politics and policy making, so that they gain in relevance? As far as your activity domain is concerned, is it possible to distinguish easily between technical knowledge on the one hand, and political values and policy preferences on the other?

This is the dilemma, "social engineering vs ivory tower syndrome". I personally was always more interested and fascinated by the "practical side" of politics and by the possibility of using knowledge to produce socio-economic and environmental results and impacts. This is probably why I went for public policy and public administration studies, and why I have chosen a policy practitioner career. At the same time, I think it is neither necessary nor possible to provide behavioural recommendations for Political Science scholars.

As for the "facts vs values" issue, I believe it is possible to distinguish them. At the same time, as I mentioned before, the policy areas in which I have worked have been rather technical, and it is quite rare that political preferences play a relevant role in my work. Certainly the traditional "right-left" continuum is less relevant than the "pro- vs anti-European integration".

IPS: For a Political Science scholar who wants to be active and produce an impact on policy making, is it easier to do it by studying the policy process or rather by being fully part of the process as decision maker?

My feeling is that by becoming a decision maker (e.g. by engaging directly in politics or public administration), the scholar tends to lose social recognition as a source of independent knowledge, and therefore he/she loses an important power resource. I tend to conclude that it is easier to do it by studying the policy process.

IPS: What is the added value of the Political Science scholar to the job of policy practitioner? And, vice versa, how is the profession of policy practitioner improving the academic work?

Keeping the two sides in connection is difficult but necessary; I see mutual benefits if this is done correctly. The practical side would gain in terms of the quality of the decisions and evidence-based policy making. The research work would improve its societal relevance, although not necessarily its quality. At the Commission there is currently a strong emphasis on evidence-based policy, including the use of social sciences. I would like to signal the fellowships initiatives available to Commission administrators to keep in contact with academia: the EU fellowships consists of an annual programme offered by many universities around the world, most of which are in the US. It includes the Weatherhead Center for International Affairs at Harvard and Yale University, as well as the European University Institute in Florence. I am Policy Fellowship Alumnus at the Centre for Science and Policy, University of Cambridge.

IPS: What are the disadvantages of mixing up theoretical knowledge and "practice"?

I see no disadvantages as such. It is rather a question of time, resources and how the mixing up is done. The policy practitioner is often result-oriented, and it is very difficult for him/her to align with the stricter methodological requirements of the academia. The quality and independence of science should not be diverted by the imperatives of the practice.

ips

Italian Political Science, VOLUME 11 ISSUE 1, JUNE 2016

SISP SOCIETÀ ITALIANA DI SCIENZA POLITICA

Political Science and the Professions of Political Scientists: EU Officials

Pierpaolo Settembri*
EUROPEAN COMMISSION

When a former student once asked me whether the PhD helped me get the job I have today, I replied without any hesitation with a resounding "No". Now that I am given the opportunity, I would like to elaborate further on how, in my personal experience, an education in political science was important for my job as an official of the General Secretariat of the EU Council and then of the European Commission. In doing so I would like to discuss both (1) the access to the European public service and (2) the daily work as an EU official. In addition it may be useful to say a few words on (3) how an EU official may interact with academia and vice versa.[1]

1. Getting an EU job with a background in political science

The way I ended up working for the European Union has little to do, directly, with my decision, at the age of 19, to embark on a University degree in political science. At the time of making that choice the EU was hardly on my radar screen. Yet, it would be unfair to say that this choice has not played any role, albeit an indirect one. My interest in the EU came a couple of years later when, as an Erasmus student in Sweden (Uppsala University), I became fascinated by the academic and human diversity to which I was suddenly exposed. This was also when I was required to identify a topic for my undergraduate dissertation. At that moment, still under the influence of that Erasmus experience, I picked a research topic that would have allowed me to continue to enjoy that European flavour. This is how I ended up writing on the party system in the European Parliament. From that moment onwards – as a good illustration of path dependence – I never studied or worked on anything that was not related to the EU.

Yet that did not immediately translate into a job in the EU institutions. For about five years I continued to train as a political scientist specialising in various European topics. It was not at all clear to me, then, what I would do afterwards. I thus embarked on a master programme and then a PhD programme as if I were going to pursue an academic career. However, as the end of the PhD came closer, it became less obvious that I would seek a job

[1] I am grateful for the comments and suggestions to earlier drafts received from Alberto Alemanno, Samuele Dossi, Daria Santucci, Gianluca Sgueo and Martin Westlake. The views expressed here are only mine.
* The views expressed by the author are personal. They do not reflect necessarily the position of the Institutions in which he is active.

© 2016 Italian Political Science. ISSN 2420-8434.
Volume 11, Issue 1, pp. 22–25.

in academia as my ultimate goal. In the meantime, especially for personal reasons, Brussels had become the centre of gravity of my life and as a result I started to look for opportunities there. Having worked so much on the EU, the EU institutions became the primary target of my job hunt.

Access to the EU public service was (and still is) conditional on succeeding in an open competition whose main elements have evolved over time. When I sat that exam, the hardest part was a multiple choice questionnaire on verbal, numerical and abstract reasoning. The only part in which the education in "European studies" played a role was a subsequent written essay and the oral exam, which were specific to the field (European Public Administration and Human Resources). In subsequent reforms of the competition system, the specific knowledge of a field was replaced by an assessment of certain competencies, so that the specific knowledge of the EU and its policies became of secondary importance.

To summarise, studying political science made me interested in the EU, but working for the EU required (also) other skills that I acquired separately.

2. Working for the EU as a political scientist

Let's start with the good news: far from being the dominant background, a degree in political science / international relations is common to many EU officials (approximately 15% of the total). Hussein Kassim *et al.* offer some interesting figures in their 2013 book on "The European Commission of the Twenty-First Century", including the fact that an overwhelming majority (69%) have completed degrees in either social sciences or law, with economics and business comprising alone 29% of the total (p. 40).

Based on my personal experience, I found my education in political science well suited for many daily tasks in the EU institutions. Thanks to the wide range of topics it covers – from philosophy to statistics, from law to economics, from history to public policy – it makes you confident in many positions, especially those entailing coordination activities. In addition, with the recommendation for EU staff to change job after a certain number of years (usually five), a political science graduate is often considered well-versed to adapt to a new policy area and to new tasks.

At the same time, many EU jobs require specific knowledge and training that no political scientist, however versatile and skilled, can improvise or acquire "on the job". Lawyers and economists, although appreciative of your efforts, will hardly take you very seriously in a discussion that concerns *only* their domain and will not spare you a condescending look if you ever try to venture into their waters. Interaction with other profiles such as engineers and scientists is more sporadic but subject to similar dynamics. Fortunately for political scientists, very few discussions are only technical or requiring just one kind of expertise, as there is always a political/procedural dimension that makes their point of view relevant and useful.

A separate issue is to assess whether a person with an academic background in political science – e.g. with a PhD and possibly research/teaching experience – is better equipped to work for the EU public service compared to someone without that same training. Here again, the answer is both 'yes' and 'no'. Based on my experience, on the positive side, the PhD proved helpful on a number of fronts, for example to build a certain resili-

ence to stress, to work autonomously, to be rigorous on methodology, to have an eye for detail, to present arguments based on evidence and examples, to draft rapidly.

But there are also limitations. Coming from academia, I used to enjoy significant freedom, both of reflection and action. As a researcher, you define your own agenda, you can afford to have strong opinions and preferences on what you investigate and therefore you take responsibility (and credit) for your research. Moreover, I was also somehow trained to believe that, if I wanted to write on any issue, I was expected to get to the bottom of it, read all that had ever been written about it and scrupulously reference the work done by others when presenting my own contribution. Academia is a world where quality should prevail over speed: your work is only made public when it has reached the required standard level. This is epitomised by the long process to have an article published in a peer-reviewed journal.

It is of course very different when you work for a large organisation like the EU whose aim is to deliver public policies and where there is usually strong pressure to deliver quickly. To begin with, however important your role, you are only one part of a large machine whose direction is decided at higher levels. Secondly, you do not choose but are assigned tasks, such as drafting a speech, replying to a parliamentary question, providing comments to a new initiative that is being prepared. Third, you are not supposed to feed your personal ideas into performing your duties. In fact, you receive guidance on what should be the line to follow when attending to these tasks and on that basis you prepare your contribution, which is then processed by your hierarchy. You may not even be aware of the final shape of the contribution you worked on initially. Your gratification mostly comes from the recognition by your hierarchy (and possibly your aspiration to contribute to a project you believe in) rather than your external visibility.

Moreover, unlike what occurs in an academic environment, sticking to a deadline and consulting all those concerned is as important as and sometimes even more important than the actual substance of your contribution. Providing solutions to problems is the key priority and, sometimes, extreme focus on the detail or on hypothetical issues may be counterproductive and unhelpful (and will certainly not be appreciated). "Academic" is often said, almost pejoratively, about discussions that have got lost in secondary questions and are not helping to move a process forward.

Of course, these differences do not come as a surprise to those who choose to work for the EU but the transition from academia to the EU public service does require a mental shift that, if underestimated or overlooked, could lead to frustration. In other words, if you have joined the EU institutions because you were fascinated by the field of "European studies", you may be disappointed to find out that not only does your daily job not entail discussing these topics, but that you may even lose track of the academic dimension of the EU institutions once you are embedded in their daily operation. You are so focused on your area of responsibility that you risk losing perspective.

3. Interaction between academia and EU public service

Is it then all lost for erstwhile academics who end up working for the EU? Not entirely. In fact, one of the most dynamic aspects of the scholarly production on the EU is the close interaction between academics and practitioners. Over the years I have had the privilege to experience both directions of this relationship, with equally enriching results.

For my PhD (I wrote on the farm lobby in the EU) as well as for other research work, I benefitted enormously from the input and the viewpoints of the many EU officials I met and interviewed over the years. I have always considered the exchange of views with them as an inescapable "reality check" for the credibility of my work. More often than not, they challenged the ideas and hypotheses I submitted to them. They provided plenty of examples contradicting or invalidating my suppositions, shared different ideas and offered alternative interpretations of the same phenomena. The more I was into a topic and I could reply to their objections, the deeper the interaction.

Today, as an EU official, I am equally grateful for the value academics bring to my daily work when they reach out to me for their research. The questions they raise often provide a refreshing opportunity to look at my tasks from a different perspective and to put them in a broader context. As most of the work in the EU institutions is highly specialised, an external observer is – perhaps paradoxically – best placed to identify patterns that cut across policy areas and to understand their deeper implications, which may be less visible to the insiders.

The same benefits would come, of course, from regularly reading scholarly publications on the EU or from actively taking part in the academic debate through the many conferences and seminars dedicated to the EU. In reality, however, it is hardly possible to combine proper research activities with the ordinary workload as an EU official. Personal interaction is a more convenient and common way for academics and practitioners to support each other.[2]

At the same time, there is a long tradition of EU officials engaging in academic activities, including teaching in academic institutions that offer graduate courses on the EU. There are also several examples of EU officials that present/discuss papers at academic conferences and publish books and articles in peer-reviewed journals. It is no coincidence that the first two books I bought for my undergraduate dissertation on the European Parliament were written by EU officials (and a Member of the European Parliament): the seminal "A modern guide to the European Parliament" by Martin Westlake and the popular "The European Parliament" by Richard Corbett (the MEP), Francis Jacobs and Michael Shackleton.

As a former academic who strives to keep up with the academic debate and to carry out some teaching activities, I am fully convinced of the mutual benefit of the academics-practitioners relationship and of their virtuous contamination. Academics and practitioners complement and improve each other in their respective endeavours and, together, they do a better job at understanding and explaining how the EU works than they would do separately.

[2] The interaction between academic ideas and EU policy-making is of course a much broader and complex issue, which I cannot afford to address in any detail here. I would only highlight the many formal and informal opportunities offered to stakeholders, including academics, to contribute to the EU policy process as well as the evidence-based approach to policy-making embraced by the Commission, which often relies on the contribution of academics for studies, evaluations and impact assessments.

ips
Italian Political Science, VOLUME 11 ISSUE 1, JUNE 2016
SISP SOCIETÀ ITALIANA DI SCIENZA POLITICA

Political Scientists as Research and Training Experts: Angela Liberatore

Angela Liberatore has a PhD in Political and Social Science from the European University Institute, and is now Head of Unit at the European Research Council, European Commission.

IPS: Could you please briefly describe your professional role and your main responsibilities?

I lead the Unit on Social Sciences and Humanities at the European Research Council (ERC) Executive Agency. The ERC manages the Excellence 'pillar' of the EU Framework Research and Innovation Programme "Horizon 2020". It funds frontier research in all scientific domains (social sciences, life sciences, physical sciences) in a bottom up way (topics are chosen by the researchers themselves) and the grants can cover any part of the life cycle of a researcher's career (from Starting Grants to Advanced Grants). The Unit, composed of twenty-five colleagues, provides support to the Scientific Council on any matter related to the evaluation of proposals, monitoring of research projects, tackling cross-cutting issues (from gender dimensions to open access, interdisciplinarity or widening participation) in relation to social sciences and humanities.

Currently we are working, also with Units in other scientific domains, on a Conference on Science Diplomacy. This is an emerging topic in the EU and beyond, and one that I have been working on also in my previous job as deputy head of the Unit on international cooperation –with focus on European Neighbourhood, Africa and the Gulf- at the Directorate General for Research and Innovation of the European Commission (from which I am currently seconded).During more than twenty years at the European Commission I had several jobs, all related to supporting research in Europe and internationally, and linking research with policy and societal needs and actors. For example, I was part of the Commission team at the Kyoto Conference on climate change, served as rapporteur of the group on 'Democratising expertise' for the Commission's White Paper on Governance and co-organised with EEAS conferences on the regulation of private security companies, on the impacts of climate change impacts in the Middle East and on EU-US relations.

My background in political and social sciences –and philosophy- has been a key asset in all jobs I took on, including my current one. It provided me with basic knowledge, analytical tools and critical mindset to initiate and implement initiatives on a range of research and policy issues in a complex –and very diverse and interesting- institution.

© 2016 Italian Political Science. ISSN 2420-8434.
Volume 11, Issue 1, pp. 26–29.

IPS: Have you ever thought of doing your current work while you were a PhD student?

Frankly speaking, during my PhD – earned at the European University Institute – many of my friends had as a goal to work in a EU institution, while I was rather thinking about a research career. I simply love research and the cooperation in an international research project with Harvard University/Kennedy School of Government –where I also spent a semester with a Fulbright Fellowship- gave me even more appetite for further research.

Back to Italy the options to pursue research were not very bright though. I was told that I was too interdisciplinary (surely this would be much less of an issue now) as the PhD was in political and social sciences, my first degree was in philosophy – with application to economic theory, and I had been working on issues that at the time were seen as non-mainstream such as environmental policy and risk management... So I started considering the 'classic option' of migrating to the USA.

But then I saw an announcement in the newspapers about the European Commission looking for candidates to work on a to-be-launched new research programme on socio-economic and policy aspects of the environment. Initially I was not sure I wanted to pursue a career at the Commission, even if the position looked interesting and somehow 'matching' my CV, and I also thought it was probably not worth trying given the very harsh competition (later I learned that there were 600 applications for one post – it can be even worse...). But some friends encouraged me, I started liking the idea to work in the institution that has been driving European integration (yes, this has been a main motivation) and I considered (with my partner) that migrating to Brussels was less far away from my beloved Bologna and Florence than going anywhere in the USA. So I decided that I should not have to regret -one day- not having even tried! So I did, and got the job – temporary first and then permanent. I do not regret the choice, and when I felt tired with the job I had (yes, it happened –as in most jobs probably), I found ways to move to another, and also got a fellowship to do research again for one academic year.

IPS: Have your Political science studies influenced your career? What can be the competitive advantage of a background like yours in your profession?

Yes, my studies in political (and social) sciences made me interested in and familiar with European integration and institutions; the first was the basis for the motivation to join the Commission, the second gave me a competitive advantage when applying to my initial position as well as the following ones.

By knowing EU institutions, policies, decision making I have been able to contribute to various EU initiatives (e.g. Kyoto Protocol and White Paper, mentioned above, but also in linking research to policies in the fields of foreign affairs and home affairs) and somehow find my space in our admittedly not always easy administration.

Also in my current job, more focused on curiosity-driven research, my background provides a very good basis to guide my team, keep an overview of the research we support and work on issues such as science diplomacy.

A background in political science can be seen as a specialist one (to deal with issues such as citizenship, democracy, elections, international relations, etc.) but also as a generalist one (having the tools to tackle a wide range of policy areas, institutions, levels of governance, stakeholders' positions and interests). Both aspects are useful!

IPS: What kind of interaction do you think there can be between your professional community and the academia?

Well, all my work has been characterized by links between EU policy (research policy and, through it, several other policy domains) and academia. Universities are the main beneficiaries of EU funding in the social sciences and humanities (whether in collaborative research under the 'societal challenge' part of the Framework Programme or research funded by the ERC).

Academics can choose what kind of interactions they want to have with the European Commission and ERC: get the funding to do their research and advance the frontier of knowledge or also engage in using knowledge for policy advice and respond to social needs.

For political scientists it is maybe easier than for academics with other backgrounds (let's say anthropology, linguistic or psychology) to pursue also policy advice. However, this is an 'art' in itself that requires deep knowledge of the policies and actors to be advised, good skills in 'translating' scientific evidence in useful (avoiding 'reinventing the wheel' kind of papers…) and usable information and recommendations (if this is the problem, what are the options to tackle it?). Surely these are obvious issues for the readers of this journal…

IPS: From your perspective, what skills would you recommend should not be missing in a political scientist curriculum nowadays?

Flexibility! Go international and for 'brain circulation'! Let me explain…

Flexibility relates to the content of knowledge, the links with other disciplines and communities, the choice of profession. One may start focusing on any topic during PhD studies, but then it is important to be able and willing to explore (the links with) other topics; the point is not to replace 'deepening' with 'widening' (to take a dichotomy often used concerning European integration) of knowledge, but to push the frontier of knowledge and also identify other users or even co-producers of knowledge beyond academia. Many issues need cooperation with other disciplines to be seriously addressed: European integration itself can hardly be understood without links with law, economic, sociology or history; the same applies to the development of international environmental negotiations and agreements or of migration policies –just to mention some examples. And one may start thinking of a profession in academia and then pursue one in diplomacy, policy or business – or vice versa – depending on opportunities that may arise, if one is ready to see and size them. In this regard, communication skills as well as language and IT skills and the ability to work in multicultural environments can turn out to be very useful for many different professional venues.

'Go international' means that without some study and research experience abroad and some publications in English, the opportunities become much more narrow (whether one likes or resent the 'lingua franca', the need to know it is a fact of scientific life –quite obvious to readers of this journal as we are mostly Italians writing and reading in English…). It also means to develop networks that help expanding one own research, professional and personal horizons. It does NOT mean 'brain drain' but rather 'brain circulation': in many cases and countries (while admittedly not all), an experience abroad and a good CV with publications in English is an asset and 'return' of qualified researchers is actively promoted. As Italy has a long tradition of 'brain drain', I would like to conclude with a constructive note: some measures have been taken to encourage return of researchers and recent debates

indicate that while problems persist, attention is being devoted to this. In addition, measures to engage with Italian ‘scientific diasporas’ abroad can enhance mobility, knowledge sharing, networking and innovation (here one could also learn from the experience of other countries such as Ireland or, not to look too ‘Eurocentric’, India). Similarly, engaging with ‘knowledge workers’ who came to Italy from other countries, can be one of the useful ways of harvesting the potential of migration and gain first-hand knowledge of their countries of origin; something that can, in turn, have broader cultural, economic, policy implications. Perhaps a topic for further study by political scientists?

ips

Italian Political Science, VOLUME 11 ISSUE 1, JUNE 2016

SISP SOCIETÀ ITALIANA DI SCIENZA POLITICA

When Political Scientists meet EU Negotiation and Negotiators: Francesco Marchi

Francesco Marchi is a PhD at Sciences Po, Irene-Essec, and the Director of the «Negotiators of Europe» Research and Training Program.

An introduction from our contributor

Since the beginning of the Fifties, the European Union has developed through successive rounds of negotiations in which Member States were sitting around the table to take common decisions and address joint problems. Negotiation thus represents an essential element of the EU process of integration and an inbuilt feature of the EU institutional system.[1] Negotiations take place within the EU institutions, between EU institutions and its Member States, and also between the EU and third countries or international organisations. The EU is also exposed to challenges of the "age of negotiation",[2] in which the global systems of rules are constantly put into question, ideological barriers have progressively faded away and sovereign states have to address joint problems such as trade, climate change, terrorism, migration fluxes, and regulatory issues. In today's world, negotiation is such a diffuse activity that international organisations and public administrations need to rely on an important number of experts on policy content. However, they also need experts of the processes through which these issues have to be negotiated. Content expertise is no longer sufficient for finding an agreement; it is necessary to have some professional figures who are able to steer the effective processes of dialogue and negotiation that aim to reconcile divergent interests across the table. The recent "Brexit" case will certainly require some additional negotiation expertise from the EU.

* * *

IPS: Could you please briefly describe your professional role and your main responsibilities?

My work consists in helping the EU institutions increase the negotiation capabilities of their officials by organising a series of actions that range from training seminars, workshops and conferences, to the development of e-learning tools and a community of practice. At the Institute for Research and Education on Negotiation

[1] Brunazzo M. & P. Settembri (2012) *Experiencing the European Union*, Rubbettino Editore, Soveria Mannelli.

[2] Zartman W. (2007) *Negotiation and Conflict Management: Essays on Theory and Practice*, Routledge, London.

© 2016 Italian Political Science. ISSN 2420-8434.
Volume 11, Issue 1, pp. 30–34.

– IRENE,[3] based at the Department of Public Policies of the ESSEC Business School, I am the Director of the "Negotiators of Europe" Research and Training Program. Within that framework, in collaboration with EIPA (European Institute of Public Administration, Netherlands) and the College of Europe (Belgium), I have responsibility for undertaking training needs analysis in close cooperation with the EU institutions and their Human Resources Departments. My task is then to elaborate and propose training activities specifically designed for the target audience of different EU institutions such as the Commission, the EEAS, the European Parliament or the General Secretariat of the Council.

Since 2008 our institute IRENE has progressively created the "*Negotiators' Learning Path*" in cooperation with the DG HR of the European Commission.[4] This training curriculum is structured around seven seminars dedicated to negotiation skills development, covering the following thematic areas:

Basic Courses	Advanced Courses
Negotiation skills	Difficult and complex negotiations
Multilateral negotiations	Cross-cultural negotiations
	Legislative negotiations between Commission, European Parliament and Council
	Negotiating with the USA
	Negotiating with China

The seven seminars represent a total amount of teaching hours that amount to 120, divided into 14 full days of training. The Negotiators' Learning Path is organised through a system of compulsory courses (Negotiation Skills and Multilateral Negotiations) that give access to the advanced courses dealing with specific thematic areas. The pedagogy used in the seminars is strongly based on an inductive approach consisting of three sequential steps:

- **Experiential Learning through Simulations**. In each of the half-day thematic sessions, participants engage in an exercise or a simulation pertaining to a key aspect of negotiation in the EU.
- **Debriefing, Feedback & Self-Examination**. After the practice, the instructor leads a debriefing discussion for analyzing participants' performance, so that the class can identify the relationship between different negotiation strategies and outcomes and learn from everyone's experiences. This stage is a key instrument for stepping back from daily practice and understanding the driving factors that influence the negotiators' behaviours and negotiation outcomes.
- **Discussion of research findings**. During the last part of each session, the instructor discusses with participants the relevant research findings connected with the key learning points of the seminar. The aim of this part is to look at how those findings may help to identify solutions applicable to real situations of negotiation in which the participants are involved.

[3] Since 1996, and following operations in 72 countries to date, ESSEC's Institute for Research and Education on Negotiation (IRENE Paris, Singapore & Brussels) has developed as a centre of expertise in negotiation, conflict resolution and mediation.

[4] Directorate General of Human Resources – European Commission.

IPS: Have you ever thought of doing your current work while you were a PhD student?

While I was a Master student at the University of Catania, I attended a Summer University in Cluny (Burgundy) in which I had the chance of following, for the first time, a *negotiation workshop* led by Prof. Stephen Goldberg (Dispute Resolution Research Centre of the Kellogg School of Management, Northwestern University). That experience exposed me to a series of new concepts and analytical perspectives[5] that I found useful to complement my master's thesis on institutional reform of the EU. I then decided to continue this research with a PhD, focusing on the European Convention on the Future of Europe and the impact of this new institutional context on the negotiation behaviour of Member States' governments. Deepening my knowledge of negotiation theories also gave me the opportunity to become familiar with new pedagogical tools based on an inductive approach and the use of simulation exercises. I then started to progressively introduce some of these elements of negotiation analysis into the courses on EU policies and institutions that I was teaching at my university in France. The combination of my expertise in the EU system, negotiation theories and active learning methodology gave me the opportunity to join the IRENE Institute while I was still doing my PhD studies. This was a unique chance to discuss my research findings and refine some of the hypotheses of my PhD research at that time. The regular contacts with EU negotiators and officials were a sort of reality check for what I was trying to demonstrate in my research.[6]

IPS: Have your Political science studies influenced your career? What can be the competitive advantage of a background like yours in your profession?

Training EU officials and diplomats is a very challenging job because you need first to have a deep understanding of their daily working environment and then you need to provide concrete answers to their problems.

Today, the great majority of negotiation skills seminars rely heavily on the classic Harvard Program on Negotiation approach of "*principled negotiation*", whose famous manifesto is the textbook "Getting to yes" by Fischer and Ury.[7] This approach is certainly one of the most operational and highly efficient for teaching negotiation skills; however, it needs to be adapted by taking into consideration the specific aspects and features of the negotiation environment in which participants in the seminar will have to operate, if this is a public, international organisation such as the EU.

The first challenge I encountered for this adaptation is that negotiation is not an autonomous discipline in itself, but is rather a field of research to which different disciplines are contributing with their theoretical and research traditions:[8] disciplines such as game theory, bargaining analysis, organisational studies,

---

[5] Lewicki R., D. Saunders, et al. (1997) Essentials of negotiation, Irwin/McGraw-Hill: Boston; Hopmann, P.T. (1996) The Negotiation Process and the Resolution of International Conflicts, Columbia, SC: South Carolina University Press; Fischer W. and R. Ury (1981) Getting to Yes, Harvard University Press: Boston.

[6] Marchi F. (2015) The Convention on the future of Europe: how states behave in a new institutional context of negotiation, Peter Lang, Brussels.

[7] Fischer W. and R. Ury (1981) Getting to Yes, Harvard University Press: Boston.

[8] Druckman, D. (2010) Negotiation, in N. Young (Ed.) The International Encyclopaedia of Peace, New York: Oxford University Press.

international relations and political science. However, in the last few years a growing scientific literature has started blending together negotiation analysis traditions with political science for analysing the functioning of the EU system,[9] with interesting results. My knowledge of this body of literature was an extremely important asset because it allowed me to integrate EU specific aspects into my negotiation training and teaching activity.

The second challenge was that exercises and simulations need to be in line with the principle of the "*right distance*".[10] This means that you cannot train EU officials with simulation exercises that are about the selling of a restaurant or a real-estate transaction; this scenario would certainly be too distant from their real professional life. At the same time, it would be of relatively low utility to train EU officials with a simulation exercise that repeats precisely the kind of situations and procedural rules they are exposed to on a daily basis; this would simply reproduce their routine, in an artificial way, without giving them the possibility to challenge their practices and reflexes. The "right distance" consists of working with scenarios that are fairly similar to the daily practices of the participants but at the same time present relevant differences that may stimulate changes in their reflexes.

IPS: What kind of interaction do you think there can be between your professional community and the academia?

Many scholars have emphasised how important is the distance between those who practice negotiation and those who study it. Researchers have no direct access to negotiations, and they often have to rely on interviews, questionnaires, official documents or experimental work carried out in a laboratory with students. For example, experimental research findings are certainly valuable, but one question remains open: how would these findings change if the participants in these experiments were real diplomats or EU officials? Would they have the same reflexes as the students? What would be the effect of their professional EU experience? Moreover, researchers do not necessarily make the effort to translate their findings into operational and applicable solutions for real life negotiators.

Practitioners, for their part, are often trapped in severe time constraints, and they do not necessarily take the time to look at the interesting findings that research is producing. Academic research is perceived as complicated, not operational and too theoretical to bring any concrete help to their professional life.

A more effective dialogue between these different worlds would certainly benefit both sides: researchers could reinforce their contacts with the field and its actors; practitioners could learn many lessons from research findings. The way forward would be a circular approach helping researchers, practitioners and trainers to profit from each other's' experience by breaking the existing glass walls.

IPS: From your perspective, what skills would you recommend should not be missing in a political scientist curriculum nowadays?

In today's world, any political science curriculum should include activities based on active pedagogy that stimulate the problem-solving skills of students such as simu-

[9] Dur A. , G. Mateo & D. Thomas (2010) Negotiation theory and the EU : the state of the art, in 'Journal of European Public Policies', Vol. 17:5, pp. 613-618.

[10] Colson A. (2013) L'usage des simulations de négociation, in Balzacq T. and Ramel F., Traité de relations internationales, Paris : Presses de Sciences Po, pp. 1081-1095.

lations, group projects, international exchanges and workshops with practitioners. The acquisition of knowledge represents the bedrock of any curriculum at the university. But what makes the difference is the development and acquisition of soft skills. We have to acknowledge that the most prestigious European Universities have integrated, in their political science programs, a few key principles around which they have built their reputation:

- A compulsory period to be spent abroad that ranges from 6 to 12 months;
- Some group project or simulation to stimulate creativity and active learning skills;
- The introduction of a compulsory internship of 6 to 12 months;
- Contact with practitioners or professionals that share their experience with students;
- Increased use of English as a teaching language;
- The introduction of “clinical programs” in which students have to advise professionals;
- Investment in the “high-technology literacy” of students.

This may not be possible everywhere, and we know that costs, in terms of human resources and mentality change, may be high for teachers as well as for students. However, the effort is certainly worth trying.

Bibliography

Brunazzo M. and P. Settembri (2012) Experiencing the European Union, Rubbettino Editore, Soveria Mannelli;

Colson A. (2013) “L’usage des simulations de négociation”, in Balzacq T. and Ramel F., Traité de relations internationales, Paris: Presses de Sciences Po, pp. 1081-1095;

Druckman, D. (2010) Negotiation, in N. Young (Ed.) The International Encyclopedia of Peace, New York: Oxford University Press;

Dur A., G. Mateo and D. Thomas (2010) “Negotiation theory and the EU: the state of the art”, in Journal of European Public Policies, Vol. 17:5, pp. 613-618;

Elgstrom, O. and Jonsson, C. (2000) ‘Negotiation in the European Union: bargaining or problem-solving?’ Journal of European Public Policy, Vol. 7(5), pp. 684–704;

Fischer W. and R. Ury (1981) “Getting to Yes”, Harvard University Press: Boston;

Lewicki R., D. Saunders, et al. (1997) “Essentials of negotiation”, Irwin/McGraw-Hill: Boston;

Marchi F. (2015) The Convention on the future of Europe: how states behave in a new institutional context of negotiation, Peter Lang, Brussels;

Raiffa, H. (1982) The Art and Science of Negotiation, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press;

Zartman W. (1994) “Introduction: Two’s a Company more’s a Crowd: the Complexities of Multilateral Negotiations”, in Zartman W. (Ed) International Multilateral Negotiation: Approaches to the Management of Complexity, Jossey-Bass: San Francisco;

Zartman W. (2007) Negotiation and Conflict Management: Essays on Theory and Practice, Routledge, London

ips

Italian Political Science, VOLUME 11 ISSUE 1, JUNE 2016

SISP SOCIETÀ ITALIANA DI SCIENZA POLITICA

Political Scientists as Public Intellectuals: Sofia Ventura

Sofia Ventura is an Associate Professor at University of Bologna and Adjunct Professor at School of Government – LUISS Guido Carli of Rome. She is a Political Scientist, with a specific interest in Comparative politics, Italian and French politics, Political leadership and Political communication. She holds a PhD in Political Science (University of Florence). From 1997 to 2007, she taught at the Eastern College Consortium composed of Vassar College, Wellesley College, Wesleyan University based in Bologna. She has held seminars and lessons at the Faculty of Political Sciences of the Sapienza University of Rome, at the Italian Institute of Human Sciences (SUM) in Florence, at the Universities of Pavia and Urbino, at the Sciences-Po Paris and at the Université Paris XII. She has been a member of editorial staff of the «Rivista Italiana di Scienza Politica» (January 2007 - December 2009) and from 2010 is a member of the editorial board of the «Rivista di Politica – RdP» directed by Alessandro Campi. She has been a columnist for the Corriere della Sera of Bologna, the weekly L'Espresso and the monthly magazine of Il Sole 24 Ore. Now she is a columnist of QN – Quotidiano Nazionale. She is regularly invited as a political analyst in leading radio and tv channels.

IPS: You are a scholar that is also an active participant in public and political debates through commentaries in radio and TV programs. Is your public engagement a result of fortuitous circumstances or something that you deliberately chose to do?

I would say that it is the result of a great interest I have always had for politics, which is the main thing that led me to choose political science as a graduate student. It is the same interest that led me to take part in the *Gioventù Liberale* and to build political connections over time. When you are intensively interested in an area, it is almost inevitable that you will end up working in it.

IPS: Do you think it is possible to keep academic knowledge apart from personal preferences and political inclinations? And does it make sense to keep them separate?

This is the problem for all scholars that want to engage and shape the public debate. What I mean is that, in principle, it is possible to be "objective" based on the technical knowledge that derives from academic work. However, the danger is always looming that we will use the same knowledge for serving the political convenience or political sympathy of the time. This risk gets magnified when vanity kicks in the motivations that lead scholars in the public arena.

© 2016 Italian Political Science. ISSN 2420-8434.
Volume 11, Issue 1, pp. 35–37.

IPS: Basically we run the risk of quickly turning from useful to dysfunctional participants in the public debate?

I think it is important to remember that our science is not an exact science. As a result, if we want to be "correct" we should not liken our knowledge to a mathematical equation. What we can say is that our knowledge leads us to make probabilistic conclusions about political phenomena. The problem arises when we try to elevate our knowledge to some kind of universal truth. When this happens, I think that our value to the public debate significantly diminishes.

IPS: Well, let's assume a "benevolent" scenario where scholars engage with public debates with the aim of contributing to improve them. What are the most important contributions that political scientists can bring to the table?

I think that political scientists can really provide a useful contribution in a number of important respects. First, we can improve public understanding of the complexities that characterize political and social phenomena. Specifically, we can bring in a systemic approach that helps shed light on the interconnections among the various parts of the political and social system and how change in one part affects the others. Second, political scientists can alert the public and policymakers about the risk of unintended consequences that stem from political and constitutional choices. Third, political scientists have a lot to say about the impact of public policies—and this is a key contribution.

In doing that, political scientists can be of help in fostering a more informed public debate, especially at a time in which such a debate is particularly poor (probably not *just* in Italy, but particularly so in our country). Our methodological toolkit is also important here. For instance, when I write for newspapers or participate in TV programs—and at risk of appearing boring—I adopt the methodological tools that come from the study of political science. I can give you an example that builds from my work on political narratives. As public debate is replete with narratives, what I try to do in my public appearances is to show that these narratives are far from providing causal explanations and that more attention should be devoted to clearly establishing lines of causation when explaining political outcomes.

IPS: Until now we have been discussing the contributions of political science to public and political debates. What about the other line of causation? In what respect does public involvement improve academic work and how?

Well, the first answer is that public engagement drains off a lot of resources from academic work! In general, however, more than improving academic work, public engagement with the world we study provides a deeper knowledge of it. Then, of course, it very much depends on the research object. In my case, being immersed in a network of people that makes the political communication is of great advantage as I get close to the object of study. In a certain sense, it is a kind of participatory observation.

IPS: What is your take on the relevance of political scientists to the public debate? Do you think that public engagement is a recipe for relevance or not?

Yes, I think it is. Of course, getting outside a university class to the public debate requires personal inclinations and not all academics might be willing to do that. Yet it is necessary to exit from our offices to comment in a newspaper at least. It is also necessary to bear in mind that when we address non-academic communities, it is of

utmost importance to use different linguistic codes' and make the results of our research appealing and accessible. Moreover, this, of course, requires a lot of effort.

IPS: What about our relationship with policymakers and their choices? Are we able to be heard, particularly as compared to academics working in other fields as lawyers or economists?

A general problem in our country is that politics tends to rely on political scientists, economists or lawyers only at the point in which political choices need to be legitimized. Policymakers do make a selective use of technical competences. In other words, they approach us already with an idea of what they want to do rather than with the question of how to reach a specific goal.

Having said that, for political scientists the other challenge is that we cannot provide policymakers with definitive answers on the courses of action they want to pursue. Furthermore, we find ourselves operating in a cultural tradition that attributes lawyers' pride of place in the management of "cosa pubblica".

IPS: A not too favorable environment to get a hearing, right?

Yes, but the problems are also of our making. For instance, our quest for specialization risks denting the very contributions we can make to public and political debate. As the doctor that knows everything about one part of the body is not necessarily able to cure a fever, so an excessively specialized political science risks losing understanding about how political systems operate.

ips
Italian Political Science, VOLUME 11 ISSUE 1, JUNE 2016
SISP SOCIETÀ ITALIANA DI SCIENZA POLITICA

Book Reviews

Section edited by Carla Monteleone and Stefania Panebianco

MAURIZIO CARBONE and JAN ORBIE, *The Trade-Development Nexus in the European Union. Differentiation, coherence and norms* (London, New York: Routledge, 2015). 132 pp., £95,00 (hardback), ISBN: 9781138816701

The nexus between trade and development has been crucial within the European Union (EU)'s common commercial policy since at least the first Lomé Convention in 1976. Under the Convention, the EU essentially granted preferential access, aid, and investment to former colonies in Africa, the Caribbean, and the Pacific (ACP). In the 1990s, the neoliberal agenda encapsulated in the World Trade Organization (WTO) agenda reduced the policy space for these kinds of agreements, forcing the EU to substitute the Lomé Conventions with the Cotonou agreement in the year 2000. In general, the pervasiveness of the neoliberal discourse and the rising diversification of development paths in developing countries have somehow led the European Union to rethink its approach to preferential trade agreements, aid for trade, and the complex dynamics between development imperatives and commercial interests at large.

A very rich and detailed account of all these issues is presented in this book edited by Maurizio Carbone and Jan Orbie, which is actually a reprinting of a special issue (March 2014) of the journal *Contemporary Politics*. We learn from the itroduction that differentiation, policy coherence, and norms are the focus of the collective work, with the purpose of assessing the evolution of the nexus between trade and development while at the same time shedding light on the challenges the EU has to address in order to increase the credibility, and thus the effectiveness, of its trade policy vis-à-vis developing countries.

As far as differentiation is concerned, it seems that since the adoption of EU Commissioner Peter Mandelson's *Global Europe* agenda in 2006, on the one hand, the EU has put economic interests above other considerations, favoring free trade agreements with emerging powers, and on the other hand, Brussels has shifted t-oward reciprocity in dealings with the developing world and also gradually phasing out the general system of preferences for upper-middle income countries (Stephen

© 2016 Italian Political Science. ISSN 2420-8434.
Volume 11, Issue 1, pp. 38–53.

Woolcock and Gabriel Siles-Brügge respectively address these aspects in their chapters).

On coherence—or rather, (not surprisingly) incoherence—between trade policy and other policies of the European Union, the volume examines horizontal, multilateral, and partner coherence. For instance, tensions between Directorate General trade and Directorate General development are highlighted in Carbone's chapter, while Patrick Holden underlines how different discourses on regional integration, the free market, and pro-poor actions often collide, an exception being high coherence in the policy of sanctions between trade, development, and foreign policy (Clara Portela and Jan Orbie). Multilateral coherence (referring to the EU's relationship with international organizations) is examined under the lenses of International Labour Organization policies (Mark Langan on decent work) or the OECD Development Assistance Committee (Carbone on untying aid), but it is logically intertwined with partner coherence (the need to offer partners a practice in line with official discourse), such as in Patrick Holden's chapter on the WTO and the EU's aid for trade policy.

A third and final dichotomy in the book regards norms and interests because in the literature, some influential voices argue that the EU has become more similar to a self-interested realist power, thereby de facto abandoning (or at least strongly qualifying) its stance as a normative power or a "benign partner" (see Anders Ahnlid and Ole Elgström's contribution), which has always presumably been the defining feature of the EU as a global actor. In other words, the EU seems more and more interested in promoting its commercial interests at the expense of meaningful and sustainable development of local economies. Why is this so? Apart from the self-evident need after the Great Recession to tap into external markets' demand to help the recovery of the European economies, the authors offer some tentative explanations. For example, Siles-Brügge puts forward a political economy explanation, arguing that the EU is in search of open markets for its companies, and everything else is subordinated to acquiring and keeping leverage in free trade negotiations. Ahnlid and Elgström look to role theory to explain how the new EU realism might be seen as a reaction to the increasing role emerging economic giants claim on the global scene. Tony Heron refers to constructivist and historical arguments to explain how the problems with the reform of the ACP trade regime were caused by a divergence between institutional paths and ideas, with the former prevailing over the latter. Holden makes use of critical discourse analysis to give evidence of the deep undercurrent tensions in the EU's flow of policies and discourses on development and trade. Finally, under a "moral economy" perspective, Langan shows how the Economic Partnership Agreements will have "deleterious consequences for the lives of many poorer producers and workers in ACP countries," and he points out that a serious reflection on possible alternative instruments is needed in order to overcome the "normativity-outcomes gap" that is weakening the EU's foreign policy consistency.

The general impression the reader gets from the valuable contribution to the literature found in this fascinating book is that political and economic differentiation among developing countries has found the European Union rather unprepared to

smoothly adjust its trade and development nexus, and, consequently, the EU reaction (also influenced by the EU's own internal dynamics) has led to general incoherence in a general environment of norm confusion, to the extent that Alasdair R. Young in the conclusive chapter talks about "a lack of common understanding of what a norm is." This seems to be quite a poor achievement for a regional bloc that is, as Carbone and Orbie pointedly remark in the introduction, "'the world's largest trading power..., the biggest importer of products from developing countries..., [and] the largest provider of development assistance." Indeed, the EU looks like a confused actor striving to find its way within a rapidly evolving international order, with a real gap between (strong) power resources and (weak) effectiveness. It might also be the case that beyond the pro-poor rhetoric, the European trade policy under the present Commission, made explicit by the 2015 Communication "Trade for all," has a real focus on delivering economic opportunities' for "consumers, workers and small companies" alike within the EU market, sending development concerns to the margins of the discourse.

The EU, in fact, seems to be aware of contradictions in the trade-development nexus given that the new Horizon 2020 call for research projects also includes the specific theme of assessing the coherence of the EU trade policy with all other relevant EU policies. This is a welcoming sign: as Carbone and Orbie write at the end of their conclusion, it is necessary "to move beyond Brussels-centric analyses and concentrate on the effective impact of the EU's trade-development policies on the ground," adopting a clear interdisciplinary approach. In the meantime, this volume provides a wealth of knowledge and a true starting point for future research.

Giuseppe Gabusi, *University of Turin*

* * *

LORENZO CLADI and ANDREA LOCATELLI, *International Relations Theory and European Security. We Thought We Knew* (London, New York: Routledge, 2016). 246 pp., £90,00 (hardback), ISBN: 9781138847279

European security and defense policies have been an object of analysis among international relations (IR) scholars for decades. However, it was the end of the Cold War that brought about a resilient cooperation on security and defense among European Union (EU) member states: beginning in the 1990s, the CFSP and the ESDP (both renamed CSDP, the Common Security and Defence Policy, by the Lisbon Treaty) emerged as key policies of European external action. The renewed military ambitions of the *civilian power*, as the EU as an international actor was initially understood, contributed to the creation of a number of institutions and agencies. Accordingly, in the last twenty-five years, the process of integration in the sphere of *high politics* (defense and security) after the remarkable integration of *low politics* (common market) inevitably attracted the attention of IR scholars.

Notwithstanding the considerable amount of academic literature and scholarship devoted to the topic, the EU's foreign and security policies still constitute an empirical puzzle. The phenomenon is too complex (due to the multiplicity of actors and institutions involved) and too *new* (since the EU is neither a state nor a traditional international organization but a new-flanged supranational political body) to be easily grasped by a single theoretical perspective. Above all, the hybrid political nature of the EU hinders analysis, and this is particularly true for the two main traditional paradigms of IR: Realism that relies on state-centrism and Liberal-Institutionalism focused on international organizations. However, the EU is neither a cohesive political unit nor an inter-governmental organization. The peculiarity of the European integration was captured by Kenneth Waltz in 1993 (and his words are still meaningful today) when he contended that "[m]any believe that the EC [*European Community*] has moved so far toward unity that it cannot pull back, at least not very far back. That is probably true, but it is also probably true that it has moved so far toward unity that it can go no farther. The easier steps toward unity come earlier, the harder ones later, and the hardest of all at the end".1

In this view, the authors adopted an original theoretical perspective, inspired by *analytic eclecticism*, an epistemological approach that was recently suggested by Sil and Katzenstein.2 It is particularly suitable for analyzing complex phenomena that are marked by multiple interactions in which different mechanisms and processes (drawn from different paradigms) are at play and that raise both practical dilemmas for decision-makers and academic debates. The CSDP comprises all these features. Thus, following this epistemological line, the book looks at the CSDP through the theoretical lenses of the main IR research traditions.

Analytic eclecticism applied to the CSDP could have ended up merely adding theoretical complexity to the complexity of the object of analysis. However, that risk was avoided—and this is the primary merit of the volume—for a number of reasons. First, even though the contributions differ on the theoretical perspective adopted, they are consistent on one point: in coming to terms with the CSDP, a single paradigm as a catch-all explanation is not convincing. Put differently, indulging in parsimony for theoretical elegance is not an appropriate starting point for seriously grasping the CSDP. Second, the complexity of the CSDP and the hybrid character of the European integration clearly invite a *problem-driven* approach rather than a *theory-driven* methodology based on a single paradigm. In this view, analytic eclecticism is neither a way to evade theoretical analysis nor an excuse for theoretical inaccuracy. On the contrary, its aim is to make inter-paradigmatic dialogue fruitful for investigating the causal drivers behind a complex phenomenon. Third, the book effectively uses the IR research traditions (and the possible dialogue among them) to shed light on three dichotomies concerning the drivers of the CSDP: material vs. ideational factors; national vs. systemic variables; and state vs. society interests.

Throughout the book, the relative role of—and interplay between—material and ideational variables is touched on. Even if the editors and contributors do not aim to ascertain whether a paradigm is better than others, they show how both material and ideational factors shape the CSDP. More empirical inquiries are needed, as the

editors admit in the Conclusion, but it is important to stress how the volume represents a promising starting point for using the dialogue between different paradigms to explain when, how, and why material or ideational factors prevail over the others. Chapters 2, 5, 6, and 10 already do that, but the same approach can be fruitfully applied to other policies related to the CSDP. The same argument can be used for the state vs. society dichotomy to determine when, how, and why states behave as unitary actors or how societal demands (within a state) affect government decisions. From this point of view, the volume offers a resilient, original, and promising contribution to the literature on EU security and defense policies and, potentially, on the European integration in general.

However, the distinction between levels of analysis—systemic vs. national—is more ambiguous. The editors and some contributors rightfully assert that both systemic and national variables are at play in the CSDP. However, even chapters that address domestic aspects (chapter 3 and 4) concede that systemic changes, particularly the end of the Cold War, cannot be easily discharged as negligible explanatory variables. Conversely, they seem to recognize, in part implicitly, that the new security environment has been the *permissive* condition for European cooperation on security and defense policies. Domestic factors were decisive for the CSDP's development but probably thanks to the opportunities offered by the new international scenario. In this case, the contribution of inter-paradigmatic dialogue between systemic and reductionist theories to grasp the CSDP are more elusive.

Andrea Carati, *University of Milan*

* * *

Fabrizio Coticchia and Francesco N. Moro, *The Transformation of Italian Armed Forces in Comparative Perspective. Adapt, Improvise, Overcome?* (London, New York: Routledge, 2015). 162 pp., £95,00 (hardback), ISBN: 9781472427519

After the end of the Cold War, Western armed forces changed dramatically. The international context as well as the threats those armies were designed to face became increasingly nuanced and unpredictable. In particular, because the mutable nature of war is well-known among decision makers and military élites, *adaptation* became a sort of *mantra* in the process of reframing the most important Western defense bodies. After more than forty years of stability—or at least a clear and relatively static scenario—after September 11, Western armed forces entered into an era of relentless deployment vis-à-vis insurgencies, regional rivalries, and humanitarian emergencies. This transformation, however, did not follow a linear path.

Based on some of the authors' prior studies on the Italian army and, implicitly, on the strategic narrative of the Italian decision makers, *The Transformation of the Italian Armed Forces* investigates how that process concerned the Italian armed forces. A similar framework of analysis was also applied in part to the French and

British cases. The main scientific outcome of the manuscript is thus a clear and almost comprehensive overview of the ongoing evolution of the so called European way of war.

The preliminary assumption of Fabrizio Coticchia and Francesco N. Moro's study is that the evolution of Western armed forces requires interaction between *macro* and *meso* levels of analysis. These means of investigation are complemented with interviews and primary sources. The first part of the book (chapters 1 and 2) highlights the dimensions of the transformation of the armed forces, and the following sections (chapters 3, 4, 5, and 6) are focused on the process itself and its dynamics.

The third chapter is an exhaustive assessment of the defense transformation and its peculiarities in Italy, France, and the UK. Key official documents illustrate the main doctrinal changes that occurred in these countries both in the Nineties and after 9/11. One merit of the Coticchia-Moro study is that its analysis also involves budget transformations and the role played by NATO and the EU defense policy in the process of adaptation and, excluding Libya, operational convergence.

The empirical part of the work illustrates the Italian military operations undertaken since 2001. With the valuable aim of filling a gap in the security studies literature through an innovative approach, in chapter 4 the authors observe the degree of coherence along three different dimensions: a) the force deployment with the type of mission; b) the adaptation to the environment through the existing doctrines as well as the learning on the field; and c) the channels of communication among strategic levels. In the following sections, Coticchia and Moro summarize and discuss the contents of chapters 3 and 4 in order to subsequently illustrate the defense model that emerged in the last decades and some of the risks related to the ongoing international scenario and that way of war. Through this study, Coticchia and Moro have pursued—successfully indeed—the valuable aim of filling the gap between the operational reality of the Italian armed forces (involved in a range of military operations abroad such as ISAF, Antica Babilonia, Operation Leonte, and Unified Protector) and domestic indifference or misperception about their international stance.

A mixed explanatory and analytical intent shapes the entire book. Fresh empirical sources and a unique access to military and official documents, complemented by selective interviews with the key personalities involved in transforming the Italian army, enhance Western war-making literature with a nuanced picture of twenty years of activity among the three most important European defense forces in their relations with both the United States and the non-state actors of the 21st century international system.

Although *The Transformation of the Italian Armed Forces in Comparative Perspective* does not entirely fill the existing gap in this field of analysis, it of course serves as useful reading for those scholars and practitioners who aim at developing a critical view of the role of coercion in Italian foreign and military policy.

Marco Valigi, *University of Bologna*

* * *

MANLIO GRAZIANO, *Guerra santa e santa alleanza. Religioni e disordine internazionale nel XXI secolo* (Bologna: il Mulino, 2015). 360 pp., €25,00 (paperback), ISBN: 9788815254382

In October 2015, Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu of Israel, in a speech to the Zionist Congress, said that "Hitler didn't want to exterminate the Jews…he wanted to expel the Jews." Netanyahu was referring to a supposed conversation in which the grand mufti of Jerusalem, Haj Amin al-Husseini, had protested to Hitler that "they'll all come here," referring to Palestine. Netanyahu then quoted Hitler asking Husseini, "So what should I do with them?" and Husseini as answering, "Burn them!" This controversial speech came at a time of spiraling violence in which the Israeli leader had repeatedly accused Palestinians of lying, mainly about Israel's actions at a contested holy site in the Old City. Most of the Israeli historians and some Israeli politicians joined Palestinians in denouncing Netanyahu for falsity in saying it was the mufti who gave Hitler the idea of annihilating European Jews during World War II. In *A Place Among the Nations. Israel and the World* (1993), Netanyahu had already argued against the perfidious West and the untrustworthy Arabs, affirming that the question of what to do with the large Arab population in Israel would be solved by massive Jewish immigration. The view that Netanyahu holds of Middle Eastern history is quite simple: endless betrayal by the West of promises made to the Jewish people, ferocious hostility by the Arabs, and heroic achievements by the Israelis.

Undoubtedly, the main quality of Manlio Graziano's book is to suggest a more complex view of Middle Eastern and world history. As Graziano underlines, Husseini was first appointed grand mufti by the British, then he joined the Axis powers, and finally he became a third-world leader. The roots of his various "holy wars," proclaimed from time to time against the enemies of his patrons of the moment, lie in the foreign offices of the most developed nations rather than in the sands where the Muslim tradition emerged. His commitment was part of a sort of pedagogy of hate that was paving the way for our times, when religions re-emerge instrumentally or by filling the political vacuum left by the de-secularization of the world. Facing the declining pillars of the Westphalia temple, also Israeli politicians are not unfamiliar with this post-secular trend in international relations.

Graziano's book is divided into four sections. The first three cover, respectively, the theoretical, historical, and analytical perspectives on the "holy war" as a potential occurrence. The final section is devoted to the book's main thesis, namely, the possibility of a "holy alliance."

The theoretical section revolves around two discursive hinges or pivotal reasoning. First, the turning point of modern secularization started with the displacement of the geopolitical axis of the world from the Mediterranean to the Atlantic and Indian oceans. The powers confined to the Mediterranean, i.e., the Italian city-states and the Ottoman Empire, saw the beginning of their decline, and with that, the two religions that had their territorial center in the region started to decline. Second, the

theory of secularization with its two corollaries about the autonomy of the political and the sovereignty of the state are currently challenged by the "return of God." This development takes place in today's globalized world that was shaped by the decolonization process. Post-secularism is already visible in megacities, where—as a consequence of massive rural exodus and urbanization—there has been a revival of "universal morality" in the heart of the polis. The end of the capitalist expansion of the West that characterized the so-called *trente glorieuse* and the recent rise of Islamic capitalism both contributed to this outcome.

The historical part of the book is a broad and rich overview of the religious Great Awakenings that began in the seventies, although a sort of preview had already occurred in Indonesia (1965). These developments are manifest in the Islamization of Egypt (1971) and Pakistan (1973), in Israel and India since religious parties conquered the public sphere (1977), in the Iranian revolution (1979), but also in Sri Lanka, Burma, and even the United States. In particular, Graziano focuses on the case of Afghanistan (1979), where he observes the potential for international disorder or the coming of a holy war. He also puts the "catholicization of modernity" that arose after the election of Pope John Paul II (1978) in the context of this religious revival.

In the analytical part, Graziano overturns most of the stereotypes on which Huntington's thesis of a "clash of civilizations" is based, but he also lays the foundation for criticizing the opposite commitments to dialogue or alliance of civilizations because these help spread the belief that the world is divided along religious fault lines. In particular, Graziano dwells upon the invention of the West, the supposed monolithic nature of Islam, the reality of bloody boundaries along Huntington's fault lines (including Buddhism and Hinduism), and the features of religious terrorism. This part of the book is a general analysis of the nexus between religion and politics far beyond the study of international relations.

The last part of the book presents the thesis of the holy alliance. According to Graziano, in the post-secular world, the decisive fault line is global in scope, and it divides the last warriors of the Westphalia temple on one side from the new religious forces that are reshaping the globalized world on the other. To confront international disorder, the only possible way out would seem to be that of a holy alliance guided by a Catholic alliance. The thesis of a holy alliance led by the papal hegemony is twofold. On the one hand, it is based on the Vatican narratives, beginning with papal encyclicals. On the other, it depends on the nature of the Holy See, in particular its "power of statelessness" that makes the pope a geopolitical pivot.

If the first three parts are an excellent and essential discussion on the geopolitics of religions, the final argument seems rather an exercise in the "cosmopolitics" of religions. In 1990, Stephen Toulmin stated that the hidden agenda of modernity was a vision of Cosmopolis as a material society rationally ordered. Can the vision of Cosmopolis as a spiritual society morally ordered be considered the hidden agenda of post-modernity? Aside from the exclusion of other civilizations, can this project be implemented in the Holy See of Rome instead of in the Old City of Jerusalem?

Emidio Diodato, *Università per Stranieri di Perugia*

* * *

Simona Piattoni, *The European Union. Democratic Principles and Institutional Architectures in Times of Crisis* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015). 320 pp., £55,00 (hardback), ISBN: 9780198716273

Since its foundation, the European Union (EU) has been an innovative experiment that challenged many traditional principles of Western politics such as sovereignty and statehood. From the perspective of political science, the EU is a formidable research lab for a long list of classical topics. Among these, one of the most exciting exercises for scholars is to determine "the nature of the beast" by finding a new or existing political and institutional format that fits with the characteristics of the European Union. A second "cool" topic is the legitimacy of the EU in terms of both common values and democracy in the political processes. Nevertheless, in the last years, the crisis has presented complex challenges to the European Union and to scholars involved with analyzing its political system.

Moreover, the euro crisis necessitated a joint response to save the single currency, and European politics became more salient; for the first time, it was collectively perceived as strongly intertwined with domestic politics by European citizens. This edited volume explores the impact of the euro crisis on the institutional structure of the EU and proposes a theoretical frame for understanding the institutional changes that should take place in response to the existential threat that the Eurozone crisis represented. The book's basic contention is that the crisis was a push factor for reforming the institutional structures of the EU and for increasing the level of citizens' participation. Simona Piattoni, editor of the book and an Italian scholar with deep knowledge of and research experience on the European Union, has framed contributions from outstanding scholars in order to connect the topic of the EU's institutional and governance structure with the problem of legitimacy and accountability of the Union's political system, taking into account the shock effect the last economic crisis had on the people and governments of the member states. Based on the premise that in time of crisis, "the future of [the] EU will depend on its capacity to address broad societal problems in a way which is consistent with EU citizens' preferences," this book challenges the theoretical perspective of the EU's "output legitimacy" and stresses the need to "stick to democracy as a basis for legitimacy."

The substantive scope of this analysis means that the book addresses a number of ongoing debates in EU political science scholarship by providing a common frame for the analysis and evaluation of the quality of EU democracy. In her introduction, Simona Piattoni identifies six democratic principles, delegation, accountability, representation, transparency, responsiveness, and participation that serve as theoretical and methodological guides for contributors. The classical debate on the EU's democratic deficit is discussed by Fossum and Pollak with a new perspective. They evaluate the democratic performances of the EU in the light of the six abovementioned principles without underestimating the challenge of "accommodating diversity" that the EU must face in designing its institutional

structure. Agné and Neyer debate the notion of legitimacy in two different chapters. Agné's contribution criticizes the actual institutional architecture of the EU because this latter does not provide citizens with the power to influence the common institutions and their work. Neyer argues that the EU should increase the role of national Parliaments in order to legitimize policy outputs, with particular regard to monetary and finance policy. Crum and Curtin and Nicolaïdis, Burgess, and Fabbrini analyze the Union's actual institutional structure.

In particular, Crum and Curtin evaluate the accountability of the EU by analyzing executive power and decision-making procedures. They argue that the EU suffers from institutional and political ambiguities that determine lack of accountability. Nicolaïdis applies the notion of "demoicracy" to the EU's political system in order to highlight the EU's specific needs in organizing its political system, with particular regard to the necessity of conciliating different and, in some cases, opposite requirements. Burgess approaches the democratic dilemma of the European Union from a federal perspective that is combined with a revisited version of historical institutionalism. In this perspective, he argues that some federal objectives as stated by the Founding Fathers marked a path that is still valid and they could contribute to establishing a political and institutional strategy for moving the EU forward.

Fabbrini, in his contribution, focuses on the double logic underpinning the EU's actual institutional arrangements: the supranational Union and the intergovernmental organization. Both logics coexist in the Treaty, but in times of crisis, they can be uncomfortable for the system in terms of both effectiveness and democracy.

In this perspective, Fabbrini argues the need for a Treaty reform in order to substitute the double logic of intergovernativism and supranationalism with a coherent model of compounded democracy that can reconcile the union of states and the union of citizens.

Smismans and Kröger analyze the Union's interest representation system. Smismans, in his contribution, discusses the main debates on modes of participation in the EU and identifies some basic principles that should be considered for every future reform of the EU's institutional architecture. Kröger frames the topic of democratic representation in the larger perspective of political equality and introduces the issue of representation deficit in the EU policy process as one of the main concerns for the EU's political system. Benz's chapter is focused on a further classical concept in EU studies: the multi level governance model (MLG). His analysis is centered on the reconciliation between representative democracy and the multilevel governance system in order to demonstrate that that MLG can be a democratic mode of governance.

The main value of this text is that it incorporates the institutional analysis of the EU into the debate on the legitimacy of the integration process with particular attention paid to the challenge posed by the economic crisis. It highlights the crisis's crucial role, not only showing that the crisis determined a request for more participation but also investigating how and by whom the institutional architecture of the EU should be reformed in order to face the new European environment.

The result is a collective volume that makes compelling reading and that will prove a valuable resource not only for EU scholars but more broadly for researchers in comparative politics.

Francesca Longo, *University of Catania*

* * *

ANDREA PRITONI, *Poteri forti? Banche e assicurazioni nel sistema politico italiano* (Bologna: il Mulino, 2015). 256 pp., €24,00 (paperback), ISBN: 9788815257468

Located in the research tradition developed in the Department of Political and Social Sciences of the University of Bologna, which in recent years has been an important driving force for a renewed attention to "interest politics," which had never found a solid base in Italy, Andrea Pritoni's book attempts to give an answer to the classic Lasswellian question "Who gets what, when and how?" In order to do that, he focuses on the Associazione Bancaria Italiana (Abi–Italian Bank Association) and the Associazione Nazionale fra le Imprese Assicuratrici (Ania–National Association of Insurance Companies), two actors that so far had not been closely analyzed but that have always been identified as having "strong powers," that is, powers that often if not always make them capable of enforcing their preferences and specific interests in decision-making processes that may be of concern to them.

The research objective of this book is to identify and measure these two actors' access to policy making and to transform this access into a true influence on outcomes by focusing attention on three extremely important decision-making processes in the *policy fields* of credit and insurance: the conversion of Decree Law N° 223/2006 into Law N° 248/2006 ("Bersani's first 'lenzuolata' of liberalizations"), the conversion of Decree Law 7/2007 into Law N° 40/2007 ("Bersani's second 'lenzuolata' of liberalizations"), and the conversion of Decree Law N° 1/2012 into Law N° 27/2012 (the liberalizations made by the technical government headed by professor Mario Monti).

Before presenting the results of his empirical research, in the first two chapters Pritoni suggests a thorough review of the international literature on the lobbying capacities and strategies that groups may adopt. In particular, in the first chapter, the author, embraces the idea that before being a (more or less) relevant actor in the policy-making process, every group is also and above all a complex organization that needs a certain structure and specific resources. He then proceeds by classifying and identifying four ideal types of groups, each of which insists on a certain segment of representation and has a prevailing organizational mission.

The second chapter explains the research strategy and the methodology used. Here an interesting review of the literature regarding lobbying and policy analysis is proposed. Moreover, after having identified some approaches that in his opinion are

best suited to achieve the goals set, the A. elaborates some research hypotheses to explain the influence that specific groups have on decision-making and does that by looking at the relationships between organizational resources held by specific groups and the characteristics of the policy issues analyzed. Finally, Pritoni presents a series of proposals for operationalizing the concepts used.

The other chapters show the results of the research: the third describes the structure and the organizational resources; the fourth shows the lobbying strategies used; and the fifth focuses on the influence of groups in the three processes previously mentioned. As for the structure and organizational resources, the data used are easily accessible (different groups' statutes, the central and territorial organizational articulation, the number and types of bureaucrats, the extent of membership, representativeness, expertise, and skills that groups can mobilize, the symbolic resources, the confidence in the organization as assessed through surveys). Pritoni analyzes the type of lobbying and the tactics and strategies of influence in the decision-making process by looking at the activities of two groups in a specific year (2012) and, to identify these tactics, strategies and types of lobbying, conducts semi-structured interviews with the leaders of the organizations. Furthermore, the author attempts to reconstruct a series of group actions (mobilizations, civil disobedience, appeals to civil and administrative justice to change wrong policies, strikes, etc.). With regard to the problem of influence in the three decisional processes that were previously analyzed, Pritoni, perfectly aware of the difficulty of measuring this influence, opts for a minimalist strategy of research by suggesting control over the results of the decisional process, which measures the influence in terms of distance between the outcomes that have occurred and the demands expressed by all participating actors. To calculate this distance, the A. uses both qualitative and quantitative analysis of the content of important documents, especially the articles and subsections related to the issues to which the groups are considered most susceptible, and asks eight experts to estimate the innovations introduced by the legislation analyzed despite the presence of group preferences in favor of the status quo. It must be said that only three of the experts responded positively to the request for cooperation and evaluation, and this made the effort to attempt a quantitative analysis "disproportionate".

Overall, the results of the empirical research showed that the analytical-conceptual schema proposed in chapter one holds. The third chapter, in particular, shows a new image of the organizational traits of the two actors studied, and the hypothesized proximity to the ideal type of corporate interest group of both associations is confirmed by most of the empirical dimensions analyzed. As for lobbying and the logics of strategic action, although they show some contradictions, the collected data validate the roles of the insiders in both associations, including their possession of vast economic, political, and informational resources that allow the leaders constant access to both political and bureaucratic policy makers. This access, however, does not seem to turn into influence in any decision-making process analyzed in chapter five: in fact, the empirical analysis shows that neither the Abi nor Ania were able to exert any influence. Pritoni considers that because the three decision-making processes were not particularly complex and they concerned ex-

tremely important policy issues on which public attention is rather high, the lack of influence can be considered not surprising. He also considers that the Abi and Ania could nevertheless be considered strong powers *but not always strong*: especially when the issues are very important and/or poorly specific and technical, they appear to be forced to accept unwanted policy results.

As plausible as it is, this interpretation does not seem to be sufficient to eliminate some small doubt about the adequacy of the data collection tools and approaches used. It does not seem daring to assume that the relations between political actors and interest groups deserve more attention and that more attention should be given to that *gray area* between the "visible policy of the invisible policy," which is definitely not detectable through the interviews with the organizations' leaders but is also not absent. None of this, however, calls into question the scientific relevance and usefulness of the fine work of Pritoni, especially the theory and methodology discussions.

In conclusion, we can only agree with Pritoni, who considers his research to be the beginning of a study that has significant empirical evidence on two actors that political analysis neglected and that uncovers a reality that needs further investigation.

Orazio Lanza, *Università di Catania*

* * *

DONATELLA M. VIOLA, *Routledge Handbook of European Elections* (London, New York: Routledge, 2016). 786 pp., £150,00 (hardback), ISBN: 9780415592031

This book, edited by Donatella Viola, is a remarkable work for a number of reasons: first, for its size—786 pages (in addition to the 36 pages of prefaces and the prologue) organized into 32 chapters plus a synoptic appendix on European politics and an analytic index; second, for its content. The heart of the book ("Part II – Country Reviews") consists of 27 chapters concerning the EU member states written by academic experts from various countries. The different national cases are classified according to the historical evolution of the EU building process and of the chronology of the various enlargements. Only the case of Croatia, which joined the EU in 2013, is not analyzed because the book was originally an analysis of the 2009 EP (European Parliament) elections. The 2014 elections, however, are explained in a supplementary chapter written by the editor (where the Croatian case is included). These last elections appear crucial because of the electioneering process and the problematic outcomes in the context of the deepest economic crisis since the postwar period.

These chapters are organized according to a standard structure: after a brief but useful country-specific profile (geography, history, geopolitical profile, political parties, electoral system, and form of government), the results of all the European

elections (from 1979 to 2009) are retraced and usefully compared with the results of the national elections. Overall, this long section of the book precisely constitutes a valuable "Handbook" of European politics and elections. But there is more: It also offers a specific interpretation that is well underlined in the foreword by J.H.H Weiler, one of the main scholars on the politics of the European Union. In particular, he writes, "it is a virtue of this project that it understands that Europe in general, and the machinations of European democracy in particular, can only be understood by *close attention to the specificities of the national Member States*" (p. XXVIII, emphasis added). In brief, the national context is important, and indeed, the national dimension and the supranational dimension interact constantly. This fact does not mean that we should forget that the supranational level has its own "emerging qualities"; it is also true that institutions matter. However, there is no doubt that the Handbook describes a variety of features and specific outcomes of the single countries that highlight the differences between old and new member states (chapter 31).

But the *Routledge Handbook of European Elections* is also important for its specific topic. In this regard, the three chapters in Part I in with Viola outlines the general framework of the entire work are particular useful and interesting. Chapter 1 retraces a brief history of the European Parliament, underlining its transformation from an "appointed Consultative Assembly" to a "directly elected legislative body" and from a legislative body without powers to an institution with greater ability to influence European politics, that is, from a functioning to a functional body. Chapter 2 addresses the classical structural and functional analysis of the EP emphasizing the specificity of a supranational Assembly, starting from aspects such as the EP's location in Strasbourg and Brussels (but also the Luxembourg headquarters of the General Secretariat of the EP) and multilingualism. From this chapter there emerges the exceptional nature of an elected international body that, having the role of representing many nationalities, has increasingly become a composite assembly in terms of size and number of states: from 142 seats of the six members in 1958 to 751 seats of the 28 member states in 2014. The chapter then addresses the political groups in the EP, identifying them as forms of transnational political proto-organizations. The dynamics of European parliamentary groups, especially if analyzed in the long run, are interesting in a number of respects: a) the evolution of the main European ideological families, 2) their internal variance, and 3) the instability of their composition during the same legislature. Photographs of European politics tell us much about the structural transformation of national politics.

The first part of the book ends with a chapter that looks at two main theoretical perspectives that have characterized the international debate on European elections: the second-order election model (SOE; also applied to regional and local elections, as well as to the mid-term elections in the United States) and the Europe salience (ES). The first theory emphasizes national voters' perceptions of the European elections. This leads to identifying some typical characteristics of European elections (that tell us a great deal about the deficit of institutionalization in the EU as a polity): "1) low turnout; 2) focus on National issues rather than European issues; 3) the defeat of government parties; 4) defeats of major parties; and 5) the

impact of timing of EP contest within the domestic electoral cycle on the results for ruling and big parties" (p. 41). This voting pattern is closely associated with the distinction between expressive voting and strategic voting, where the voter's choice is influenced by the expectations of a candidate or a party's success. These expectations are usually higher in the proportional systems (generally used for European elections).

However, with the progressive evolution of European integration, although the SOE model has not disappeared, the Europe salience theory has gained ground; Europe-related issues increasingly have bearing on political parties' programs and voters' preferences. In particular, the salience theory involves three hypotheses regarding European elections: we have 1) better performances by Green parties; 2) gains by extreme parties; and 3) success of anti-European parties. After the economic crisis of 2007–08, the salience theory gained greater prominence, and the 2014 elections have been read as a success of the anti-European attitudes.

At this point, it is appropriate to shift the focus on Chapter 31 ("Final Remarks"). This chapter explicitly and systematically compares the first seven European elections (it would have been useful to also include the 2014 election, which instead is analyzed in the chapter that closes the volume) based on some divergent key features, i.e., whether the 27 member states are big or small (under the geopolitical profile), old or new democracy (pre or post-1974), pro-EU/Euro or anti-EU/Euro (soft or hard Euro-skepticism), but the chapter also aims to verify the SOE and ES models. Essentially, "the core postulates of the Second-Order Election theory continued to be upheld, even following the subsequent treaty changes that have gradually expanded the role of the European Parliament" (p. 696). European elections continue to work as a rematch over national competition. At the same time, "[the] European salience theory has gained some ground, since voters' choices have slowly been directed to movements that confer an increasing relevance to Europe" (ibid.). That means the increasing diffusion of Eurosceptic and populist parties. Particularly, after the long and intense economic crisis of 2007–08, the last European elections showed the existence of some fractures or structural conflicts that may harm the EU's existence: between euro-zone and non-euro-zone countries (United Kingdom, Scandinavia); between weak (southern European democracies plus Ireland) and strong (continental democracies) euro-zone countries; between Western and Eastern countries; and between the stronger states such as France and Germany that struggle for hegemony.

Ultimately, the volume is important because it draws attention to other issues related to European politics starting from the paradox between powers (increased) and legitimacy (in decline) of the European Parliament and of the EU itself. This raises some questions. How can a polity without politics exist, especially if the policies are perceived in a negative way by citizens? What is the relationship between parlamentarization and the "constitutional" equilibria that occur in the quadrangle made up of the supranational institutions (Parliament and Commission) and the intergovernmental institutions (European Council and Council of Ministers)? Are most decisive elections sufficient to ensure accountable and representative institutions? More generally, will they strengthen the EU's legitimacy? In conclusion,

regarding the Tower of Babel depicted on the cover of the book, will there the negative side of the conflicts prevail or the positive side of the opportunities? More generally, the book, edited by Donatella Viola, leaves us with a (implicit) question: Does the EU mark a further development in democracy, from the city-states to the national states and, therefore, to a supranational order? In other words, does the EU herald the advent of a post-democracy?

Francesco Raniolo, *University of Calabria*