

Impariamo a imparare

un articolo

Una Costituzione da buttare?

Leaders

Where to file it

Europe's constitutional convention has produced a lamentable piece of work



WHEN it first began to be argued that the European Union needed a proper constitution, *The Economist* warmly endorsed the idea. The Union, we agreed, needed a single text to codify the overlapping and incompatible treaties that had gone before. More than this, we urged, Europe needed a clear statement of what the Union was, and what it intended to be—in effect, a lasting constitutional settlement! Perpetual constitutional revolution, the prevailing mode of European integration thus far, is no longer serving Europe's citizens well. It sows confusion and discontent, and it distances people from government. Bring on the constitutional convention, we said, to solve these problems and more.

There was always a risk that the convention would not design a particularly good constitution. What was harder to imagine was that the convention would produce a text which would worsen the very problems it had been instructed to address. This is what it has somehow contrived to do. In many ways the draft constitution, at 2100 pages long, makes the Union's constitutional architecture harder to understand than it was before. That is an incredible feat. Worse, it weaves perpetual constitutional revolution more securely into the Union's legal fabric. The draft, admittedly, gets one or two things right: it is not entirely devoid of sense (see pages 21–23). But for the most part the text is sound on points that are relatively unimportant. Everything that is crucial it gets wrong.

The Economist June 21st 2003 11

La Gran Bretagna si è sempre caratterizzata per uno spiccato «antieuropeismo». Significativo fu quanto avvenne nel 2003, mentre l'Unione europea era impegnata a scrivere una *Costituzione per l'Europa* (che non sarebbe poi stata ratificata). Gli inglesi furono ostili al punto che *The Economist* del 21 giugno 2003 intitolò *Where to file the Europe's new constitution* («Dove archiviare la nuova Costituzione per l'Europa») e mo-

strò il posto adatto: un cestino della spazzatura!

1 «There was always a risk that the Convention would not design a particularly good constitution. What was harder to imagine was that the Convention would produce a text which would worsen the very problems it had been instructed to address. This is what it has somehow contrived to do. In many ways the draft

The Economist

India v China

PAGES 12 AND 57–59

IBM on the march

PAGE 61

Crackdown in Iraq

PAGE 39

TECHNOLOGY QUARTERLY

AFTER PAGE 50

Where to file Europe's new constitution



Availa... £4.20 Denmark ... DK41 Greece ... £4.20 Italy ... £4.20 Namibia ... NIS18.20 Portugal ... £4.50 Spain... £4.70

Bulgaria ... £4.20 Slovakia ... £4.20 Poland ... £4.20 Norway ... £4.20 Portugal ... £4.50 Spain... £4.70

Belgium ... £4.20 Ireland ... £4.20 Luxembourg ... £4.20 Sweden ... £4.20 Portugal ... £4.50 Spain... £4.70

Croatia ... £4.20 Malta ... £4.20 Slovenia ... £4.20 Turkey ... £4.20 Portugal ... £4.50 Spain... £4.70

Cyprus ... £4.20 Germany ... £4.20 Israel ... £4.20 Malta ... £4.20 Poland ... £4.20 Portugal ... £4.50 Spain... £4.70

Danish ... £4.20 France ... £4.20 Netherlands ... £4.20 Portugal ... £4.50 Spain... £4.70

Estonia ... £4.20 Hungary ... £4.20 Portugal ... £4.50 Spain... £4.70

Fiji ... £4.20 Italy ... £4.20 Portugal ... £4.50 Spain... £4.70

Finland ... £4.20 Lithuania ... £4.20 Portugal ... £4.50 Spain... £4.70

Greece ... £4.20 Malta ... £4.20 Poland ... £4.20 Portugal ... £4.50 Spain... £4.70

Hungary ... £4.20 Portugal ... £4.50 Spain... £4.70

Iceland ... £4.20 Portugal ... £4.50 Spain... £4.70

Ireland ... £4.20 Portugal ... £4.50 Spain... £4.70

Latvia ... £4.20 Portugal ... £4.50 Spain... £4.70

Lithuania ... £4.20 Portugal ... £4.50 Spain... £4.70

Macedonia ... £4.20 Portugal ... £4.50 Spain... £4.70

Malta ... £4.20 Portugal ... £4.50 Spain... £4.70

Nicaragua ... £4.20 Portugal ... £4.50 Spain... £4.70

Nigeria ... £4.20 Portugal ... £4.50 Spain... £4.70

Norway ... £4.20 Portugal ... £4.50 Spain... £4.70

Poland ... £4.20 Portugal ... £4.50 Spain... £4.70

Portugal ... £4.20 Portugal ... £4.50 Spain... £4.70

Romania ... £4.20 Portugal ... £4.50 Spain... £4.70

Slovakia ... £4.20 Portugal ... £4.50 Spain... £4.70

Slovenia ... £4.20 Portugal ... £4.50 Spain... £4.70

Spain ... £4.20 Portugal ... £4.50 Spain... £4.70

Sri Lanka ... £4.20 Portugal ... £4.50 Spain... £4.70

Turkey ... £4.20 Portugal ... £4.50 Spain... £4.70

Vietnam ... £4.20 Portugal ... £4.50 Spain... £4.70

Yemen ... £4.20 Portugal ... £4.50 Spain... £4.70

Zambia ... £4.20 Portugal ... £4.50 Spain... £4.70

constitution, more than 200 pages long, makes the Union's constitutional architecture harder to understand than it was before. That is an incredible feat. Worse, it weaves perpetual constitutional revolution more securely into the Union's legal fabric. The draft, admittedly, gets one or two things right: it is not entirely devoid of sense. But for the most part the text is sound on points that are relatively unimportant. Everything that is crucial it gets wrong.»

Sintesi

Dopo averlo tradotto, identifica il principale problema trattato nell'articolo appena letto e fai un riassunto (non superiore alle 4-5 righe) che ne sintetizzi l'idea essenziale.

Comprensione del testo

Spiega il significato delle espressioni che seguono (tratte dall'articolo riportato).

The convention
A particularly good constitution
The draft constitution
The Union's constitutional architecture.....
The Union's legal fabric
Things right
Devoid of sense
It gets wrong

Qualche riflessione

Sulla base dell'articolo appena letto rispondi alle seguenti domande.

- 1 Che ne pensi della foto riportata da *The Economist*?
- 2 Secondo l'articolo «what was harder to imagine was that the Convention would produce a text which would worsen the very problems it had been instructed to address». Quali sono questi problemi?
- 3 «The draft, admittedly, gets one or two things right: it is not entirely devoid of sense». Ti sembra corretto nei confronti dei membri della Convenzione?
- 4 «Everything that is crucial it gets wrong». Cos'è «cruciale» per *The Economist*?
- 5 Il Progetto sarebbe poi diventato una vera e propria Costituzione per l'Europa, firmata dai 25 membri che allora facevano parte dell'Unione europea. Perché non è mai entrata in vigore?
- 6 Il Parlamento italiano ha ratificato senza problemi la Costituzione per l'Europa. Perché non è stato indetto un referendum?

Approfondiamo

- 1 Individua la posizione politica de *The Economist*. Pensi che abbia influito sul pesantissimo giudizio del giornale?
- 2 Ripercorri le principali tappe del processo di integrazione europea negli ultimi 50 anni, e individua il ruolo tenuto dalla Gran Bretagna.
- 3 Il fallimento della Costituzione per l'Europa ha poi portato alla firma, e alla ratifica, del Trattato di Lisbona. Come è avvenuta in Gran Bretagna la ratifica del Trattato di Lisbona?
- 4 Verifica se l'architettura istituzionale delineata nel Trattato di Lisbona sia così diversa da quella della Costituzione per l'Europa.
- 5 Col Trattato di Lisbona quali nuove istituzioni sono entrate a far parte dell'Unione europea?