

The Newsletter of the Sussex European
Institute

*A Jean Monnet Centre of Excellence
A Marie Curie Research Training Centre*

Sussex European Institute
Arts Building, University of Sussex, Falmer, Brighton BN1 9SH
Tel: +44 (0)1273 678 578; Fax: +44 (0)1273 678 571; email: sei@sussex.ac.uk
Co-Directors: Professor Jim Rollo and Professor Helen Wallace
<http://www.sussex.ac.uk/Units/SEI>

Issue 18

Autumn Term 2000

Message from the Co-Director

Let me open by welcoming the new intake of students. You have come to one of the most interesting places in Britain and indeed Europe to study and research on European issues. You will find committed and involved teachers and supervisors and a lively research culture which puts a premium on good ideas, and rigorous methods. It will be hard work. It is designed to be so. But I hope also it will be exciting and fun both intellectually and in the more usual meanings of those words - certainly Brighton offers many opportunities for a lively social life.

Let me also begin by congratulating Helen Wallace, my Co-Director and Founding Director of SEI, on being made a Fellow of the British Academy. This is the highest honour that can be bestowed on a scholar in Humanities and Social Sciences. It underlines the high regard that Helen is held in her chosen field and beyond. It is hugely deserved and I am sure it gives great pleasure to all Helen's colleagues.

The energy within the Institute was illustrated over the last 5 months by the number of conferences and meetings which took place. Two are particularly

noteworthy since they were run by students. First, on 11th and 12th May MA in Contemporary European Studies (MACES) students held a conference on Security in Europe – Instability on the Periphery? which involved EU officials and speakers from London Embassies including the High Commissioners of Malta and Cyprus. This precedent sets a challenge for this years MACES class to do better. Second, the Research Students (and particular thanks go to Matt Browne and Henrike Müller) organised a conference on 20th June on Constitutionalism and Legitimacy which attracted as its key note speaker Prof Joseph Weiler of Harvard University as well as speakers from the European Parliament, the Bundesbank and the WTO and featured presentations from our own students (◆ see p.9 for a conference report). Congratulations all round for two extremely good and interesting conferences.

Staff members were also busy. Charlie Lees ran a one-day conference on the Third Way in Europe on 26th May. Paul Taggart and Aleks Szczerbiak brought together a group of scholars to discuss the different forms of resistance to European integration across Europe under the title of Opposing

Europe on 23rd June (◆ see p.8 for more details on the project).

The Centre on European Political Economy (CEPE) which is the main instrument by which SEI raises external research funding was set up 3 years ago with a 3 year grant from the University with the aim of becoming self-sufficient within that time frame. That objective has been met. To mark that achievement we ran a 2 day conference on 6th and 7th July which picked up on research carried out in the Centre over the last 3 years and currently underway. Speakers included the Vice Chancellor, Prof Alasdair Smith, as well as Prof Joseph Francois from Erasmus University and Pierre Jacquet from *l'Institut Francais des Relations Internationales* and myself. The Conference was closed by John Mogg Director General of the EU Commission Single Market Directorate. Attendees and discussants came from the EU Commission, the WTO Secretariat, as well as from London Embassies, government departments and business (◆ see *CentrePages* for more details).

Finally, Prof Helen Wallace, Co-Director of SEI and Director of the ESRC Research Programme "One Europe or Several" which is based in SEI, held a conference on 21st and 22nd September covering all the themes in the Research Programme (◆ see p.10 for more information). Speakers from outside the programme included Graham Avery, from DG Enlargement in the European Commission, Chris Beauman from the EBRD, Alyson Bailes, British Ambassador Designate to Finland and a former Head of the WEU Institute.

SEI also hosted along with the School of Legal Studies a visit by Prof John Jackson from Georgetown University, Washington DC. Prof Jackson is perhaps the primary academic lawyer in the world on the subject of the Constitution of the WTO. Alongside the visit by Prof Weiler this meant that two of the greatest legal experts

in the world on EU and WTO law and constitutions spoke in SEI. An intellectual feast for staff and students.

SEI staff were also active as paper givers and commentators at conferences outside Sussex (◆ see the 'In Brief' section on p. 13). One in particular is worthy of note. There is a close connection between SEI and the College of Europe at Natolin near Warsaw. The Vice-Chancellor Alasdair Smith, Helen Wallace, Alan Mayhew, Peter Holmes and I, all act as visiting professors at Natolin. For the first time Natolin faculty came together to hold a conference. The topic was EU enlargement. Alan, Peter and I attended from SEI. As well as papers by faculty (including Alan and me) there were presentations from senior Polish negotiators and the EU delegation in Warsaw. What became clear from this conference is that there are no real negotiations going on. The focus is on technical minutiae. Make no mistake, technical issues matter. The EU is an immensely complex regulatory mechanism. But not all issues are as important as all others. The EU seems to be saying, however, that until the applicants have legislated and implemented every jot and tittle of EU legislation it won't let them in. In its more extreme form this almost seems to say until the applicants here legislated and implemented everything the EU will not begin to negotiate.

It is not necessary for membership to have implemented everything in advance. That did not happen in previous enlargements. Arguably it is still not true for existing EU member states (just look at the number of outstanding infraction proceedings). To demand it of new members is excessive. It surely hides a lack of political will driven perhaps by fear of migration, competition for budgetary resources and pressures on the CAP etc. But a situation where the likely date of membership for the first wave is always 5 years hence is not

sensible for the EU or for political stability on its borders.

Let me just make one other point in this context. Increasingly the word differentiation is creeping into the vocabulary of politicians - see Prime Ministers Tony Blair and Göran Persson in the Financial Times of 21 September. This could be interpreted as a shorthand for "not Poland" in the first wave. If true, this would be a major mistake. Poland is the biggest country in the group of candidates. It has also been the most dynamic and successful large post communist country (leaving aside China which is arguably not post-communist yet). It offers the EU a charge of dynamism - both economically and politically. Leaving Poland behind when by most measures it is the most successful transition economy in Central Europe would be to throw the baby out with the bath water. Yes, Poland may have more to do to be ready but there is time for that and without a target date it is hard to energise political processes. But having Poland on the borders of the EU rejected and disconsolate as a way of demonstrating the difficulties of joining the club is a strategy that risks only negative returns. Think of the on-going problems round British membership, many of which are at least partially related to de Gaulle's first veto. To repeat that experience with Poland is in no one's interest.

Finally perhaps a word on the Euro. It is hard sometimes to take the short term movements in the currency markets seriously. Certainly if you are as old as I am you can remember Sterling at £1 = \$2.40 in 1980 and £1 = \$1.05 by 1984. Equally at the time of the Plaza Accord in 1985 when Central Banks successfully intervened to bring down the \$ the equivalent Ecu exchange rate was under 70 cents US compared with 88 cents as I write and \$1.20 cents in 1998. Unless there are persistent differences in inflation and

productivity, what goes up (the dollar) will come down. The timing however is all.

The difficulties for the Euro are however mainly of perception. Exports are buoyant, inflationary pressures are weak and unemployment - far too high - is falling. For the US the current account is the danger. If and when sentiment turns and the capital inflow which currently funds the deficit stops then the fall could be sudden and far. That is probably why the US authorities joined in the G7 interventions in currency markets at the end of September. Not any desire to help the Euro but rather to start bringing down the dollar to more sustainable levels.

Jim Rollo

In this issue:

◆ Editorial, Jim Rollo	1
◆ Possible Futures for the EU: A British Reaction, Helen Wallace	3
◆ Domestication & Europeanisation, Paul Taggart	5
◆ The Dynamics of Defence Policy in the EU, Adrian Treacher	6
◆ Conference Reports	8
◆ The MACES Trip to Brussels	10
◆ Research Development Groups	12
◆ SEI News	13
◆ Research in Progress	11
◆ SEI Publications	17
◆ SEI Working Papers	19

Current Issues

Possible Futures for the European Union: A British Reaction

Helen Wallace

In his speech in Berlin in May 2000 Germany's Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer commented that he had 'an eye on our friends in the United Kingdom, because I know that the term "federation"

irritates many Britons'. He might have added that his focus on the *finalité* of the European Union (EU) also baffles most Britons. The British come to this with two contradictory starting points, and with a continuingly tense debate in domestic politics on core issues of European integration. The two contradictory starting points are: first, a pragmatic (and quite common sensical) notion that European ventures should match horses to courses; and, second, a fear of exclusion from the inner circle of European governments which count.

On the one hand, it has been a consistent thread of British policy to encourage cooperation in Europe by and with those countries that were relevant to any given task. Thus in particular the British have consistently been key players in European defence cooperation since the second world war, actively and extensively engaged in the Nato alliance and in other circles of defence collaboration, including willingly engaged in active military deployment. In a plethora of other settings successive British governments have been engaged in cooperation when this made sense in pragmatic terms or in terms of critical British interests, and -- crucially -- when it was judged that cooperation with other European partners would lead to value-added outcomes in terms of public policy.

On the other hand, British governments have been repeatedly concerned that other European governments would run ahead with cooperative and integrationist adventures that would leave the UK on the margins. Their fears have repeatedly been well-founded. On many issues and at many moments over the past fifty years or so the British have discovered that, whatever the British reservations might be, others have been willing to proceed with intensified integration. The net result of these two starting points is that on those courses where the British horse was able to run, the British have been important

players, while on other courses there has been no British runner -- economic and monetary union (EMU) is the obvious case in point.

However, two new points are relevant here. One is that the current government at least is more inclined than its predecessors to accept that federalism is a normal, if sometimes puzzling, part of the rhetoric and discourse of many continental European politicians. Thus there were no anguished rebuttals of Joschka Fischer's proposals. The other point is that the organisation of the UK as a polity is undergoing fundamental change, with the implementation of forms of devolution in Scotland, Wales and perhaps Northern Ireland. Thus British politicians are being forced to think differently -- and in more explicitly constitutional terms -- about the ways in which policy powers are assigned to different levels of government -- and also about the ways in which political responsibilities are as a consequence diffused between different political office-holders.

What then can we conclude from this overview of British domestic politics? First, there continues to be a troublesome contrast of perspectives about the future development of the EU between governing and opposition politicians. Second, on the substance of further EU integration, we can expect the British government to contribute ideas and proposals for closer integration in some policy areas, whatever the continuing nervousness about EMU. Third, on the forms and methods of integration, the British now have more open minds, although with a continuing instinct to prefer organic development to 'constitution-led' blueprints.

All in all therefore the current British government is much more open than its predecessors to the vigorous development of the EU and, in particular, to strengthening EU policy regimes in important areas. These include several

articulated as targets by those who in the current debate seek to reinvigorate the momentum of integration. Foreign, security and defence policy is of special importance because the British are necessary partners in this domain. The development of JHA is becoming another such priority area for the British, a policy area which some British policy-makers liken in scale and scope to the 1992 project. As for the core issues of economic integration, the British are firmly engaged in the consolidation of the single market and in the search for European responses to the new economy. EMU is a singular exception. Beyond these core issues the British tend to be less persuaded of the case for intensified policy integration.

The British have become more relaxed on many of the issues of institutional and constitutional debate in the EU. Indeed some thought is being given to specific ideas for institutional enhancement. The British are in principle keen supporters of non-treaty reform, a task which, as far as the Commission is concerned, has fallen to Neil Kinnock to pursue. In terms of the proposals made by Joschka Fischer and others, however, the British might wonder whether the constitutional blueprint approach is the most appropriate one for taking forward the big policy issues currently on the EU agenda.

◆ *'Possible Futures for the European Union: A British Reaction'* is an extract from a collection of responses to Joschka Fischer, edited by Christian Joerges et al.

Domestication and Europeanisation (II)

Paul Taggart

The Summer term saw the final sessions in the themed series of Research in Progress seminars on 'Comparing Patterns of Domestication and Europeanisation in the New Europe' (see *Euroscope* No.16 and No.17) that had begun in the Autumn.

These seminars represented a new format for SEI in attempting to use the Research in Progress seminars to systematically examine a particular theme of interest to many of us in the Institute and to add to a particular research agenda.

Starting off the Summer sessions was Claudio Radaelli (University of Bradford) on 'Whither Europeanisation? Concept Stretching and Substantive Change'. In this paper Claudio dealt with both the conceptualisation of Europeanisation and also presented an agenda for future research. He discussed the concept of Europeanisation in the light of recent research on the impact of the European Union politics and policy. To avoid the problems of 'concept stretching', Claudio proposed a taxonomy to 'unpack' the concept and organise empirical research. He offered an explanation of Europeanisation based on mechanisms and variables that need further exploration. His agenda for future research argued for a concentration on the policy level (and its interaction with macro-structures) and a cross-fertilisation with theoretical policy analysis and international relations in order to avoid the risk of intellectual segregation.

The next paper was presented by Martin Burch (University of Manchester) and co-authored with Simon Bulmer (University of Manchester) on 'Europeanisation, Whitehall and Devolution'. Martin used European policy-making to examine how far devolution in the United Kingdom has created real change. He developed a comprehensive model of change incorporating organisational, regulative, process-oriented and systemic changes across dimensions of electoral-representation, political executive and bureaucratic dimensions. After setting out the model of EU policy-making prior to devolution, he tentatively argued for considerable and significant change in organisation and systemic terms but

marginal changes in process and regulative terms. The suggestion was therefore that change is happening at a different pace and in different ways in different domains. He concluded that devolution has created a break in the chain of European policy which was previously dominated by Whitehall, by introducing new players and constituting effectively a critical juncture in the area of EU policy-making which is the first such instance since before the UK entered the EC in 1973.

The next seminar was given by Hussein Kassim (Birkbeck College) 'Assessing the Domestic Impact of EU Policy: The Case of Air Transport'. He started from the observations that public policy research has generally ignored the EU dimension of change and that the EU literature has not really focused on the domestic effects of the EU. Using the case of air transport, particularly in the UK, Germany and France, Hussein made three arguments: (1) that EU action has radically transformed the regulatory structure governing aviation in Europe; (2) Policy development at the European level has profoundly altered the governance of the sector but have had much less effect on the market structure of the industry; (3) there has been varied impact of policy development from the European level in different states with some countries being affected more than others.

For the final session the focus shifted to the mass politics of Europe and Frances Millard (University of Essex) presented on 'Cleavages and Party Systems in Central Europe' providing a survey of the role that different cleavages played in the formation of various central European party systems. The emphasis was on applying the approaches from the study of west European party systems further eastward and on the different problems facing those collecting electoral data in the region.

Taken together the series was successful in bringing together a range of researchers

doing work on very different areas providing a wide canvas from which to try to draw out a sketch of the processes of Europeanisation and domestication. Moving geographically from case studies of large EU member states to applicant and non-applicant states and from studies on policy-making to more mass politics oriented studies, the series effectively established the range in both the understanding of the concept of Europeanisation (and of Europe) and comparison across cases made clear the differential impact of Europeanisation on different institutions, nations and policies.

The Dynamics of Defence Policy in the EU

Adrian Treacher

What are the dynamics of a defence policy in the EU?

The SEI has organised a number of events to look into the ongoing developments. Last February, we were visited by Willem van Eekelen, former-Secretary General of the Western European Union (WEU). This was followed in March by a one-day workshop devoted to issues related to current military or defence initiatives issues with the participation of Nigel Baker (Head of the European Defence section at the British Foreign and Commonwealth Office), Werner Bauwens (from the office of the NATO Secretary General), David Buchan (from the Financial Times) and Dr Terry Terriff (a NATO specialist from the University of Birmingham).

As a result of the 1997 Amsterdam Treaty, Javier Solana has become the EU's first High Representative for foreign and security policy and he is supported by a new policy planning and early warning centre. This Treaty also incorporated the WEU's Petersberg Tasks (humanitarian and rescue missions, peacekeeping

operations and crisis management) into the EU's responsibilities. At the June 1999 Cologne European Council, the EU then embraced the Franco-British and Franco-German initiatives on the European Defence Identity. As a result, the WEU is being merged with the EU. This was followed in December, at the Helsinki European Council, by the decision to create an EU rapid reaction force of some 50-60,000 troops to be operational by 2003.

Hence, by any standards, "progress" has been dramatic since Prime Minister Blair announced in October 1998 that Britain would press for the EU to acquire a defence capability.

Many practical decisions however need to be taken into account to assess whether these ambitions can be turned into reality. Several key issues are under discussion.

There exists an array of civil and military means and authorising bodies now, or will soon be available to the EU for crisis management: the High Representative, the Political and Security Committee, the Military Committee, the Commission and various of its Commissioners, ECHO, the Council, and not to mention the national governments. The current coordination of aid to Balkan countries has already revealed certain dysfunctions in the EU's manner of operating parallel civilian programmes. Guarantees have to be in place that the proliferation of new committees and posts does not produce institutional paralysis.

There are also serious doubts about the Union's ability to match the budgetary and technical requirements of autonomy in ESDP. There is no shortage of sceptics who question the feasibility of the capabilities plans (Headline Goals) to be in place by 2003. Where is the extra money going to come from to make the EU a fully autonomous military actor with, for

example, its own satellite, information and communication mechanisms, with sufficient numbers of appropriately trained and interoperable troops and with its own transport facilities? In October last year the London-based International Institute for Strategic Studies declared that unless defence expenditure by European governments was allowed to increase substantially, the formation of a serious defence capacity would "remain the stuff of communiqués".

There are also serious concerns over the whole issue of democratic accountability. What provision will there be for parliamentary oversight of a European security and defence policy? Britain and France seem to favour no role for the Interim European Security and Defence Assembly (ESDA - the restyled WEU Assembly). Rather, they accept only a limited, budgetary, role for the European Parliament (relating to the civilian side of the Union's security operations), with the primary responsibility for scrutiny resting with the national parliaments of national governments. But reliance on ESDA for this function would allow for the participation of non-EU countries associated with ESDP. This is clearly an important issue and it is unclear at this stage just how EU citizens will be involved in this process.

Finally, we have to ask just what is it that a European security and defence policy is supposed to serve? It is all very well having the instruments in place to enable the Union to respond to crisis situations, but is there yet the necessary collective political capacity among the EU membership to authorise deployment? At least six and a half years advance warning of what was to happen in Kosovo in 1998-9, for example, were not sufficient for EU members to come together as a collective whole for anything other than economic diplomacy - the imposition of sanctions on the Former Republic of Yugoslavia.

The question remains, therefore, in what circumstances would there actually be sufficient consensus for the Union to be actively engaged as a military actor? "In the name of what" would, for example, the EU Rapid Reaction Force be deployed? Is there a single set of values and interests for which the Union stands and is prepared to defend? Anyone for Diplomatic and Military Union?

Conference Reports

Workshop launches Opposing Europe Network

Aleks Szczerbiak

A new network of scholars working on Euroscepticism and the effects of the EU on domestic party systems was launched at an SEI workshop in June. The workshop on 'Opposing Europe: Party Systems and Opposition to the Union, the Euro and Europeanisation' brought together twenty country experts and scholars working on the issue of support for European integration in current and prospective EU member states. As well as establishing plans for future activities, the workshop provided some base points for an evolving research agenda.

The workshop opened with Paul Taggart (SEI) and Aleks Szczerbiak (SEI) proposing a framework for analysing the impact of Euroscepticism on European party systems.

Paul Taggart began by arguing that opposition to the EU brings together strange ideological bedfellows and seems to be related to the position of parties in their party systems, with wholly Eurosceptical parties at the peripheries and parties at the core generally not Eurosceptical. He also argued that it was useful to use the tools of comparative

politics to analyse the EU and those comparative approaches would benefit from being inclusive and incorporating a wide definition of European politics. The bifurcation of Europe into West and East with the concomitant EU-member states and non-member states is insufficient and being rendered redundant by the projected future enlargement of the EU.

Developing the framework, Aleks Szczerbiak argued that it was important to clarify what precisely is encompassed within the term 'Euroscepticism'. He posited a distinction between 'hard' Euroscepticism that involves outright rejection of the entire project of European political and economic integration and 'soft' Euroscepticism that involves contingent or qualified opposition to European integration (which he further subdivided into 'policy' and 'national-interest' Euroscepticism). He then went on to put forward a number of propositions that begin to explain how Euroscepticism impacts on the European party system and then to briefly consider how applicable they were to the Central and East European applicant states.

Two separate sessions then followed on the impact of Euroscepticism on West and East European party systems.

Paul Webb (Brunel University - but since September at Sussex) examined the issue of whether European integration has the capacity to forge a *realignment* of the British party system or if the system is simply *assimilating* the issue with party strata loyally following leaders on Europe. Drawing mainly on the 1999 European election results, Nick Startin (Brunel University) argued that the EU issue has the potential to realign the party system and patterns of electoral support in France. Discussion focussed on the way that it was possible for two party systems to co-exist within the same country with different constellations of parties operating in national and European elections.

Paul Lewis (Open University) introduced the discussion on the impact of European issues on East European parties. He argued that it was possible to observe a trend for attitudes towards European integration along the lines of modernity-traditionalism and state-intervention-economic liberalism. The major parties of government were bunching towards economic liberalism (with attendant support for European integration) while Eurosceptical parties were bunching in opposition around the authoritarian pole. Petr Kopecky (University of Sheffield) presented the results of his research comparing Euroscepticism in the Czech and Slovak party systems. Although party stances on European integration depended on parties' positions in their party systems, there was also an ideological element to Euroscepticism. While the intensity with which parties push Euroscepticism may vary, whether they are, at root, Eurosceptic remains unchanged and dependent on their ideologies.

The final session identified some of the key issues that need to be addressed and agreed future plans. The workshop proceedings have been published as an SEI Working Paper. An email network of scholars has also been established. There are plans to hold panels at next year's PSA conference (Manchester, 10-12 April 2001) and the ECSA conference (Madison, Wisconsin, 31 May-2 June 2001) on this topic.

If you are interested in participating in PSA or ECSA panels then please contact Paul Taggart (p.a.taggart@sussex.ac.uk). Alternatively, if you would like a copy of the workshop proceedings or simply to be added to the mailing list then please contact Aleks Szczerbiak (a.a.szczerbiak@sussex.ac.uk).

◆ Proceedings from this workshop are available at:

<http://www.susx.ac.uk/Users/ssfj3/oppeuro.html>

Constitutionalisation and Legitimacy in the EU and the WTO

Matt Browne
Henrike Müller

The aim of the conference which took place on 20 June at the SEI was to explore the different notions of 'constitutionalisation' as they are currently evolving in the EU and the WTO. While multilateral trade rules are acquiring a greater degree of bindingness, impacting directly on domestic policy choices, the EU seems to have (partially) reached the limits of the broader acceptability in market integration. We asked: what are the different processes through which the binding nature of rules increase and how does this correlate with their legitimacy in the eyes of the citizens?

The keynote address of the workshop was given by Prof Joseph Weiler from Harvard University, who offered both a comprehensive and polemical analysis of the practical and philosophical issues raised by the advent of constitutionalisation. Having argued that the Europeanisation of constitutionalisation had been influential in the degradation of republican political values, Prof. Weiler asserted that he was sceptical about the relative success of the current EU draft proposal on fundamental rights (◆ on the current debate of an EU Charter of Fundamental Rights see Helen Wallace's article on p.2).

The afternoon sessions were dedicated to analysing policy-making in the WTO and the European Central Bank, in particular the chains of accountability that exist in these organisations and how these could be improved.

During the first session, Jan Aart Scholte, University of Warwick, spoke about the democratic deficit in global economic institutions, pleading for greater horizontal accountability and more control 'from below'. However, Reto Malacrida, WTO, emphasised the dimension of vertical accountability (the member governments) as built into the WTO - frequently forgotten in the current debate. The discussion which followed welcomed the fact that the multilateral trade system was moving away from the 'club model' of the GATT. However concerns were raised over the possibilities of enhancing its legitimacy given the current contested status of the WTO.

Secondly, the ECB model was discussed as an example of legitimacy by delegated expertise. Ms Scheuber, Bundesbank Attaché to the German Embassy in London gave details of the formal criteria for accountability of the ECB. This view was contested by Chris Huhne from the Economic and Monetary Affairs Committee of the EP, arguing that the ECB enjoys greater independence from the scrutiny of the voters than the *Bundesbank* as its independence is guaranteed in the Treaty and can therefore not be changed by parliamentary majorities. Concerns were raised that this might contribute to a lack of popular support for the central bank system.

The presentations and discussions were very challenging and helped to clarify key concepts while throwing light on current developments. Organising this conference was a highly rewarding experience.

ESRC One Europe or Several? Programme Conference

The second annual conference of the ESRC One Europe or Several? Programme, directed by Helen Wallace, was held at the Sussex European Institute on 21-22 September. Over sixty researchers from the programme's projects met with policy

practitioners to report the interim findings from their projects and to debate the main themes of the programme, as well as current policy developments. Further details are available on the programme website at <http://www.one-europe.ac.uk/events/2000/conference/sep21-22.htm>

MACES Trip to Brussels

"MACES...without frontiers"

Nerissa Sultana
Dorothee Landel,
Andrew Cutting
Rune Dragset

Brussels – 'ere we go! Pick up time was 8 am – a bad omen for the next 7 mornings. Sadly, we had to leave four of us behind, due to visa problems. From Folkestone, we embarked on the unique 'Le Shuttle' experience. The very second we got to 'the other side', the continental ones of us muttered words about civilisation... By late afternoon we got to the Jacques Brel, "in the heart of Brussels". Paul was bold enough to stay with us there. No time was wasted recovering from the trip, as we soon headed for the *Grand Place*, and its pubs, bars and restaurants – were we established ourselves as 'regulars' for the week to come.

After the first night and a fair share of *bruxellois* blondes and brunettes - beers, of course – it was a challenging task to be ready by 8.15 the next day. Well prepared for thorough Fort Knox security checks, we headed to NATO HQ Brussels. After the first comprehensive briefing on current NATO political issues by Mr R. Balmforth, came the 'long awaited' highlight: a meeting with Dr Jamie Shea, NATO's No 1 Spokesperson and Sussex alumni. Needless to say, he was bombarded with questions by us all. The second briefing was on NATO enlargement, given by Mr

Robert Weaver. The third and fourth briefings occupied the afternoon. Dr Burak Akcapar dealt with PFP; and Mr James Appathurai with ESDI, respectively.

Tuesday - another traumatic early start. This time, a state of the art NATO bus took us to that place in the middle of nowhere - where SHAPE is. The drive lasted more than an hour (ample time to recover lost sleep). SHAPE stands for Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers *Europe*. We however felt that there was something American about it. Perhaps the 'stars and stripes' car dealer just across the road created this atmosphere... ? Tuesday afternoon we returned to the centre of Brussels for the two afternoon sessions, one given by Ms. Katie Harris from the ERT, another by Ms. Marion Dewar from DG Internal Market. Both sessions generated good debates.

Tuesday evening we met up with other Sussex alumni. After some confusion regarding the venue - duplication of names and institutions seems very popular in Brussels - the group settled in the *Falstaff Bar*. It was an enjoyable meeting (a round of drinks sponsored by SEI!). There was also some singing, which some people would like to forget. The evening concluded at a bar, *la Bécasse* with home brewed beer in a huge jar. ..

Wednesday was our 'day off'. Some of us had organised interviews for the dissertation, or for internships at the Commission. Others went to Antwerp, or to the *Musées d'Art Ancien and d'Art Moderne* in Brussels. The more daring of us walked as far as Waterloo only to understand what Napoleon's soldiers had felt like nearly two centuries ago... After all these diverse activities, we met again at the *Grand Place* in the evening where Jim Rollo joined us.

On Thursday morning we met Mr Hans Brunmayr, from the General Secretariat of

the Council of the European Union. The second meeting was with Ms Arancha Gonzales, head of the unit "Antidumping Strategy" at the DG Trade. She managed to get us going with her dynamic speech. It was clear and easy to grasp, even for non-economics students. The third speaker, Mr Gerd Tebbe, from the policy planning team at the DG external relations, spoke to us about CFSP. After this very busy morning - well, it was actually 2 p.m. when we left rue Demot; we enjoyed a nice lunch, in bars or in a park nearby.

In the afternoon we visited the European Parliament. We had an information briefing, by Mr. James Temple-Smithson, together with a group of American students. Transatlantic relations significantly improved...

In the evening we moved to our new hotel, the Albert Premier, courtesy of NATO. There were dozens of policemen surrounding the hotel when we arrived, and for a brief moment we imagined it was our notoriety that provoked such a police presence...

One Friday we met with representatives from UKREP (UK Permanent Representation to the EU). It started off with Mr. Daniel Pruce, giving an introduction to the work of the Permanent Representation and discussing several important EU issues. The next speaker was Mr. Mark Gray who is involved in the current IGC negotiations. We all agreed that his speech was very interesting. The last speaker was Mr. Jürgen Grünwald who gave a brief introduction to EU law.

In the afternoon, a session was held in the WEU. The WEU is at the present about to "turn the lights off" due to reorganisation, though it seemed to happen a bit early as one of our students decided to take matters into her own hands... However, the institution soon came back to life with a dynamic speech by Alison Bailes. After the

visit to the WEU, we met up with Mike Leigh from DG Enlargement. This session will be remembered for the contribution it made to the debate on enlargement: the "double-cutlery effect" was launched as a concept to explain accession countries' adjustment efforts.

Back in the hotel our newly acquired negotiation, debating and endurance skills were practised, as the group decided where to have 'the Last Supper'. We ended up having a nice, long meal in the centre of Brussels.

Saturday was spent in the bus with a short break to see Bruges. The bus and the highway back to old England was again waiting for us. Back in Sussex the weather was surprisingly good. The Sunday was spent contemplating the events and impressions of an eventful, enjoyable, and enlightening week "at the heart of Europe".

'Letter from Mitrovica'

Extracts from an email letter from Catherine McSweeney (MACES 1999/2000)

I am sitting in the UN building in Mitrovica, overlooking the famous bridge across the river Ibar that we saw in news reports, the site of a lot of fighting and tension between the Serbs and Albanians who live here. The bridge separates the Albanian south side from the Serbian north. I can see three KFOR tanks driving across it, barbed wire and French soldiers everywhere, and five checkpoints. A lovely symbol of Kosovo these days! Just to the south of the bridge are the UN and OSCE headquarters where I am. On its northern end is the notorious Dolce Vita café. It's where the 'bridgewatchers' – groups of Serbian men, many ex-Serb policemen or sent from Belgrade, who keep a 24-hour watch on the bridge and check your ID card as you come across to

the northern side. I've sat in the cafe a few times myself drinking cappuccino, looking completely out of place. It's a lovely café because you have a view over the bridge and onto the mountains, and they play lovely music, and the people are nice once you smile and say 'dobradan'. If you try to imagine Mitrovica without all the soldiers and tanks, it was probably an exquisite, typical Balkan town, surrounded by mountains and with a river winding through it into the distance. From anywhere in the town you see the ruins of a medieval Serb castle, and there's a very pretty view from the bridge in the evenings.

I'm working for OSCE for the elections. The technicalities of preparations for elections are mind-numbing, but it's interesting to work with a team of Albanians and get to know some of them. I'm working in the three most northern municipalities, populated by Serbs with a few Albanian villages. It's amazing to see rural Kosovo – very mountainous, forested, with pretty villages. I'm training internationals and local people who'll be supervising the elections at the end of October. This week we're training people to supervise 'special needs' voting - driving out to visit voters in prisons, hospitals or shut in their houses because of fear, and going through the procedures for them to vote.

Research Development Groups

RDGs provide a forum for faculty and research students to discuss research development in areas of common interest. They generally meet several times each term. Activities include reading groups, guest seminars and discussion of new research projects. For further information, please contact the convenors.

- ◆ *Comparative European Politics* (Paul Taggart, email p.a.taggart)

- ◆ *East Central Europe in Transition* (Aleks Szczerbiak, email a.szczerbiak)
- ◆ *European Integration* (tba)
- ◆ *The Foreign And Security Policies Of The European Union* (Adrian Treacher, email a.h.treacher)
- ◆ *Nation-states, Nationhood and Citizenship in the New Europe* (Adrian Favell, email a.favell)

- ◆ *Regional Economic Development* (tba)
- ◆ *States and Markets* (Henrike Müller email h.mueller)

SEI News

'In Brief'

Annika Bergman attended the First Northern Region Conference of the UACES Student Forum, Manchester Metropolitan University, 13 May, 2000 and the European Policy Research Unit, Seminar on European Governance 16 May 2000, University of Manchester.

She presented a paper at the SEI 'The Nordics, the Baltics and NATO' Sussex European Institute, Security on the Periphery Workshop, 12 May 2000. She also gave a paper at CEEISA, Warsaw June 2000 'Solidaristic Enlargement Policy? Nordic and Baltic States in the EU Enlargement Process', 2nd Convention of the Central and East European International Studies (CEEISA), Warsaw 15-17 June 2000.

In May, **Adrian Favell** participated in the Wiles Lecture series by Michael Mann at Queen's University, Belfast. In June, he participated in a conference organised by the MZES, Mannheim on 'Linking EU and National Governance', and made his final contribution to the Carnegie Endowment's ongoing Comparative Citizenship project in Lisbon. During the summer he was a visitor at the Centre for European Cultural Studies, University of Aarhus. In August, Adrian was invited to contribute to an expert's meeting on 'Citizenship and Minority Rights' at the Organisation for

Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) in the Hague.

A co-project headed jointly by **Adrian Favell** and Tariq Modood (Bristol), was selected by the ECPR and the UK ESRC as one of four projects supported at the ECPR Research Sessions in Barcelona in Sept 2000. The group project, entitled 'Multicultural Citizenship: Theory and Practice', will put together an integrated book volume which debates the normative dimensions of multicultural and ethnic dilemmas found across a range of West European countries.

Brussels-Capital Regional Government have awarded Adrian Favell a grant of around 800,000 BEF, to do a six month pilot study during Jan-June 2001 on the integration and participation of free moving European professionals in the social, economic and political life of the city.

Peter Holmes attended a workshop at the Law Dept of the EUI, Florence on Constitutional Issues of the EU and the WTO, May 5-6th. He attended an International Competition Policy workshop run by DFID, chaired by the Secretary of State, London July 24th. He presented joint work with Alasdair Young on Emerging Regulatory Challenges to the EU's External Economic Relations at the SEI/CEPE External Challenges workshop

July 7th, and also at the International Colloquium On Heterodoxy & Orthodoxy in International and Development Economics, Lisbon May 11-13th and the Athens Policy Forum, ASOE Athens, Sept 25-27th.

He attended a workshop on EU Enlargement, College of Europe Natolin, Warsaw, Sept 1-3. He was a discussant at the International Economics Study Group 25th Anniversary Conference Isle of Thorns, Sept 8-10th 2000; and SEI UACES-sponsored Research Students' workshop June 19th.

Peter Holmes was a participant in a DFID sponsored project on International Competition Policy and LDCs, with CUTS Institute Jaipur India.

With Alasdair Young he participated in a HWWA-IAI project on "Trade, Investment And Competition Policies In The Global Economy: the Case of the International Telecommunications Regime".

In June **Przemek Kowalski** attended the third International Summer School in Economics on "Regional Development and Patterns of Trade in Europe" at CEIS, University of Rome Tor Vergata, which was organised in conjunction with Villa Mondragone International Economics Seminar on " Knowledge Economy, Information Technology Revolution and Regional Development".

In July **Francis McGowan** presented a paper to a workshop on The Emerging Industrial Architecture of the Wider Europe: the Co-evolution of Industrial and Political Structures (a project in the ESRC One Europe or Several Programme), held at the School of Slavonic and East European Studies, University College London. The paper "European Integration and Enlargement - Impact on State Strategies" dealt with some of the conceptual issues raised by the project. These issues were also raised in a joint presentation with Slavo Radosevic at the

One Europe or Several Conference held at Sussex in September.

Also in July Francis presented a paper to an Erasmus Summer School, held in Granada on Europeanisation. The paper "The UK and the EU: Incremental Europeanisation or Persisting Exceptionalism" attempted to explain the UK-EU relationship in the context of the Europeanisation literature.

In September Francis also acted as discussant at a conference in Brussels to launch the TEPSA report "La Regulation des Services Publics en Europe".

Maryla Maliszewska worked as an intern at the World Bank over the summer. She was involved in a research project on a labour market in Poland and wrote a paper on the empirical assessment of the impact of international trade on employment.

Alan Mayhew gave lectures on 'enlargement' to the National School of Administration (KSAP) in Warsaw, June 2000. With Jacques Pelkmans, University of Maastricht, he organized a conference on 'Analysing the Accession Process' at the College of Europe, Natolin 1-3 September 2000. He is currently working as an adviser to the Polish Government, and to the Chief Negotiator of Lithuania. He has given advice to Romanian Government from Sept 30 to Oct.4 2000.

Henrike Müller attended the Ionian Conference 2000 'Facing the Challenges of the New Millennium', Corfu 19-22 May, where she gave a paper on 'Insurance Regulation in Germany: Markets or Norms?'. She attended the conference '*Generationen im Konflikt*', organised by the Alfred Herrhausen Gesellschaft in Berlin 23-24 June.

Together with Matthew Browne she organised the SEI/UACES-sponsored Workshop on 'Constitutionalisation and Legitimacy in the EU and WTO' on 20 June at the SEI, where she was one of the discussants on rule-based systems and

multi-level governance (◆ see p.10 for further details).

Lucia Quaglia, attended a summer school in Cambridge, Girton College, 10-15 August, Research Council's Graduate Schools Programme. She also participated in a summer school on Analytical Approaches to European Policy-Making, University of Konstanz, Germany, 10-16 September organised by the ECPR, Standing Group on Analytical Politics and Public Choice.

On 30-31 May **Jim Rollo** was as a Commentator at the Commonwealth Business Council conference on developing countries and the WTO, Marlborough House. On 1-4 June he attended the Conference in memory of Ray Vernon at Harvard University. At the CEPE Conference at Sussex on 6th to 7th July he presented paper on International Macro-Economic policy coordination and the Euro (◆ see *Centrepages* for the conference report). On 13th July he gave a EU seminar presentation on Transatlantic Economic Relations FCO Conference at Wilton Park. On 14th July he was at the CEPR Conference, Brussels on WTO Governance where he was one of the Commentators. He was the session leader at a Wilton Park Conference on Prospects for Trade Liberalisation on 18th July. He participated in an CEPR/ESRC Conference on Transition Economics at Heriot Watt 24-25 August. From 1st-3rd September he was at the College of Europe Conference, Natolin Conference on EU Enlargement where he gave a presentation on the Readiness of Candidate States and a Comment on Enlargement and EMU. From 8th to 10th September he was at the International Economics Study Group Conference University of Sussex, Commentator. From 14th to 15th September he attended the British Academy conference on European States and the Euro where he was a Commentator. He attended the One Europe or Several?

Conference at the University of Sussex on 21st to 22nd of September (◆ see p.10 for further details).

He was in Brussels with the MACES on 7th to 8th June and in Bulgaria from 20th to 22nd June. He spoke at the World Bank/French Government ABCDE conference in Paris on 27th of June. From 1 to 4 September he was in Warsaw for the Natolin Conference but also meeting Officials involved in preparations for EU membership and even more importantly catching up with DICES Alumni. From 20th to 21st of September he was in Brussels at Andersen Consulting where he gave a presentation on Drivers of European Government priorities in the long term.

Aleks Szczerbiak on April 10th-13th he attended the PSA National Conference, LSE, London - and gave a paper on 'Party Structure and Organisation in Post-communist Poland' as part of a panel on 'Post-communist party development' which he also convened. On October 6th-7th he participated in a conference at the Institute of Public Affairs Conference on 'A Constitution for an Expanding Europe', Warsaw, Poland. His paper was on 'Decline and Stabilisation: Changing Attitudes towards EU Membership in Poland'. With Paul Taggart he organised an SEI workshop on 'Opposing Europe: Party Systems and Opposition to the Union, the Euro and Europeanisation' (◆ see report on page 8), on June 23rd. On 16th-18th he attended a meeting of TEMPUS Co-ordinators at the Warsaw School of Economics, Poland. On September 26th he gave a briefing to next year's Polish DICES students and attended British Council/British Embassy reception for past and future DICES students.

Aleks Szczerbiak on April 10th-13th he attended the PSA National Conference, LSE, London - and gave a paper on 'Party Structure and Organisation in Post-communist Poland' as part of a panel on

'Post-communist party development' which he also convened. On October 6th-7th he participated in a conference at the Institute of Public Affairs Conference on 'A Constitution for an Expanding Europe', Warsaw, Poland. His paper was on 'Decline and Stabilisation: Changing Attitudes towards EU Membership in Poland'. With Paul Taggart he organised an SEI workshop on 'Opposing Europe: Party Systems and Opposition to the Union, the Euro and Europeanisation' (◆ see report on page 8), on June 23rd. On 16th-18th he attended a meeting of TEMPUS Co-ordinators at the Warsaw School of Economics, Poland. On September 26th he gave a briefing to next year's Polish DICES students and attended British Council/British Embassy reception for past and future DICES students.

Paul Taggart co-convened (with Aleks Szczerbiak) a workshop on 'Opposing Europe: Party Systems and Opposition to the Union, the Euro and Europeanisation' on June 23 at SEI and co-presented a paper there. Proceedings from this workshop are available at <http://www.susx.ac.uk/Users/ssfj3/oppeuro.html> (◆ details on p.8). He attended the Political Studies Association Annual Conference at the LSE in April and the workshop on Europeanisation at the University of Bradford (5-6 May).

He taught on the European Studies MA at the University of Sarajevo 19-21 May as part of the TEMPUS scheme.

Adrian Treacher was the *rapporteur* at the Politics Working Group at the NATO Defence colleges' conference on Security in South-eastern Europe, Slovenia. In September he travelled to Paris for a research visit to the French Institute for International Relations. He is currently working on a book on France and the wider world.

Helen Wallace contributed to a seminar for British Ministers in May, organized several sessions for ESRC One Europe or

Several? Programme with British and EU policy-makers and was a rapporteur at the Pontignano workshops in September. She organized a panel and contributed to others at the International Political Science Association triennial conference in Québec City in July, and gave a key note address at the ECSA-Canada biennial conference also in Québec.

She organized for the ESRC One Europe of Several? Programme a seminar on the proposed EU Charter of Fundamental Rights and another (with the Centre for European Reform) on 'Flexibility in the EU'.

She lectured at Cornell and Harvard in April, taught at the College of Europe, Natolin, in May and attended the European Cultural Foundation Board of Governors in the Netherlands in June, and visited Ankara for the British Council in September. She gave evidence to the House of Lords Committee looking at the EU's Intergovernmental conference in April.

She was elected a Fellow of the British Academy in July 2000.

Research in Progress Seminars

Research in Progress seminars are held each Tuesday during term time at 2:15 to 4 pm in A 71. Highlights of the Autumn Term include:

- ◆ 17.10. Soledad Garcia: 'The Local Dimensions of Poverty: A Challenge to Social Citizenship in the EU'
- ◆ 24.10. Mark Aspin 'Predicting Member State Support of European Integration'
- ◆ 31.10. Alyson Bailes 'Security Challenges for Europe in the 21st Century'

21.11. John Peterson 'Trans-Atlantic Economic Relations after the US Presidential Elections'

For further details, please see the SEI web site:
www.sussex.ac.uk/Units/SEI/rip-sem.html

SEI Publications

Annika Bergman 'Baltbat- The Emergence of Common Defence Dimension to Nordic Co-operation?' Working Paper 22. 2000 Copenhagen Peace Research Institute (Copri)

David Dyker 'The Structural Origins of the Russian Economic Crisis', in: Post-Communist Economies, vol.12, No.1, 2000, 5-24

with Stanislaw Kubiela 'Technology and Structure in the Polish Economy under Transition', in: Economic Systems, vol.24, No.1, March 2000

'Economic Performance in the Transition Economies: A Comparative Perspective', in: Science and Public Policy, vol. 27, No.3, June 2000, 15-23

Peter Holmes "The Regulation of Competition and Competition Policy at the Regional and Global Level" in Global Regionalism and Economic Convergence in Europe and East Asia: The Need For Global Governance Regimes, edited by Paolo Guerrieri and Hans Eckart Scharrer, Nomos, Baden-Baden, 2000

with Jim Rollo "The WTO after Seattle" in the Minutes of Evidence of House of Lords European Affairs Committee 10th Report 1999-2000, "The WTO: The EU Mandate after Seattle", June 2000

with Jim Rollo and Alasdair Young "The European Trade Agenda after Seattle" in "Beyond Seattle: A New Strategic Approach in the WTO 2000", edited by Falautano I., Guerrieri P., "IAI Quaderni" no.11, Rome October 2000,

Przemek Kowalski, Henrike Müller 'The Lisbon Summit and Micro-reform' in: European Policy Analyst, October 2000

Aleks Szczerbiak "Public Opinion and Eastward Enlargement: Explaining Declining Support for EU Membership in Poland," SEI Working Paper No 34, May 2000 (◆ see p.18 for a summary)

Review of Anton Pelinka, 'Politics of the Lesser Evil: Leadership, Democracy and Jaruzelski's Poland', Slavonic and East European Review, Vol 78 No 3, July 2000.

Review of Gabor Toka and Zsolt Enyedi (eds), 'Elections to the Hungarian National Assembly 1994: Analyses, Documents and Data', Political Studies, Vol 48 No 3, June 2000.

Review of Stephen White, Judy Batt and Paul G. Lewis (eds), 'Developments in Central and East European Politics 2', Political Studies, Vol 49 No 4, September 2000.

Review of Frances Millard, 'Polish Politics and Society', Political Studies, Vol 49 No 4, September 2000.

Paul Taggart published a book in the Open University Press 'Concepts in the Social Sciences' Series entitled Populism in August.

Adrian Treacher A case of Reinvention: France and Military Intervention in the 1990s, in: *International Peacekeeping*, vol.7, no.2, Summer 2000

Helen Wallace 'Der Wandel britischer Europapolitik: Ein neuer Partner für Deutschland?' In: Knodt, Michèle and Kohler-Koch (eds.) Deutschland zwischen Europäisierung und Selbstbehauptung, Campus Verlag, Frankfurt

'Studying Contemporary Europe' in: British Journal of Politics and International Relations, vol. 2, no.3, April 2000

'Flexibility: A Tool of Integration of a Restraint on Disintegration?' in: Neunreither, Karlheinz and Wiener, Antje (eds) Amsterdam and Beyond: The European Union on its way into the 21st Century

Published September 2000:

'Regulatory Politics in the Enlarging European Union – Weighing Civic and Producer Interests'

Alasdair R. Young and Helen Wallace

Manchester University Press

Forthcoming

David Dyker 'Technology Exchange and the Foreign Business Sector in Russia', forthcoming, in: Research Policy

with Slavo Radosevic, 'Building the Knowledge-based Economy in Countries in Transition - From Concepts to Policies', forthcoming, in: Journal of Interdisciplinary Economics, No.1, 2001

'Eastwards Enlargement of the EU and Economic Performance in the CEECs - The Static and Dynamic Effects', Economies in Transition, Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union, Regional Overview, EIU, No.3, 2000

Adrian Favell 'Bruxelles: capitale européenne au coeur d'un état-nation éclaté', in 'Europe: régions et communautés contre les nations', special edition of Panoramiques, edited by Dominique Pélassy, forthcoming Nov 2000.

'Immigration and European integration: new opportunities for transnational political mobilisation?' (written with Andrew Geddes), in Challenging Ethnic Relations Politics in Europe: Comparative and Transnational Perspectives, edited by Ruud Koopmans and Paul Statham, Oxford: Oxford University Press, forthcoming Nov 2000.

'Un nouveau champ politique de l'immigration? Les ONGs et mobilisations à Bruxelles' in Culture et conflits, special edition edited by Virginie Guiraudon, forthcoming Dec 2000.

Alan Mayhew 'Economics of Enlargement', forthcoming article in 'Juridikum', Forschungsinstitut für Europafragen, Wirtschaftsuniversität Wien.

Aleks Szczerbiak "Polish Public Opinion: Explaining Declining Support for EU Membership", Journal of Common Market Studies, December 2000

Adrian Treacher 'Europe as a Power Multiplier for French Security Policy', in: *European Security*, forthcoming

◆ *The editor of Euroscope is Henrike Müller. All SEI-affiliated faculty, students and staff are encouraged to submit information for the 'In Brief' and 'Publications' sections of Euroscope. Longer, substantive pieces are also welcome. All items for the Spring Term issue on disk or via email, please, to the editor (email h.mueller@sussex.ac.uk) by Monday 11 December at the latest.*

SEI Working Papers

Public Opinion and Eastward Enlargement: Explaining Declining Support for EU membership in Poland

Aleks Szczerbiak

SEI Working Paper No. 34

This paper focuses on how EU membership is impacting on domestic political debates within Poland, the largest of the EU applicant countries from the former communist bloc. It begins by examining the changing pattern of support for EU membership in Poland. There is already evidence that this has declined steadily since the accession negotiations began. In-depth polling data also suggests that the 'hard core' of Polish Euro-enthusiasts is considerably smaller than the headline figure of those who say that they will vote 'Yes' in a referendum. The best way to characterise the current state of Polish public opinion is that they *consent* to the idea of EU membership but are not particularly *enthusiastic* about it.

In the second section the possible reasons for this decline are considered while the third section examines what particular concerns underpin Polish Euroscepticism, before considering the possibility that Polish public opinion may turn even more decisively against EU membership. The paper argues that we should not be surprised that Poles have become cynical about EU. Fear of the socio-economic consequences of EU membership lies at the root of Polish anxieties and once it became

apparent that this would involve costs as well as benefits the level of support was bound to fall. At the same time, the Polish 'eurodebate' has become increasingly politicised with a division emerging between those who (allegedly) 'soft' and prepared to give in to Brussels and those who (allegedly) favour a 'tough' negotiating stance. The greatest danger for the pro-EU camp is that a stereotype develops of the kind of person and socio-occupational groups that are likely to benefit from EU membership, with certain segments of the population clearly defined as (and perceiving themselves to be) 'winners' and 'losers'.

However, in spite of the recent slippage, overall levels of support remain high. The pro-EU camp's strongest argument remains the Eurosceptics' lack of a convincing and potentially appealing alternative foreign policy and it is still extremely unlikely that Poles will vote 'No' in a referendum held within the next two or three years. Apathy and low turnout rather than outright rejection pose a greater threat to Poland successfully ratifying an accession treaty in a future referendum.

SEI Working Papers in Contemporary European Studies

The Sussex European Institute publishes Working Papers (ISSN 1350-4649) to make research results, accounts of work-in-progress and background information available to those concerned with contemporary European issues. The Institute does not express opinions of its own; the views expressed in these publications are the responsibility of the authors.

See the SEI web site (www.sussex.ac.uk/Units/SEI) for a full listing and abstracts.

1. Vesna Bojicic and David Dyker June 1993
Sanctions on Serbia: Sledgehammer or Scalpel
2. Gunther Burghardt August 1993
The Future for a European Foreign and Security Policy
3. Xiudian Dai, Alan Cawson and Peter Holmes February 1994
Competition, Collaboration and Public Policy: A Case Study of the European HDTV Strategy

- | | | |
|-----|--|----------------|
| 4. | Colin Crouch
<i>The Future of Unemployment in Western Europe? Reconciling Demands for Flexibility, Quality and Security</i> | February 1994 |
| 5. | John Edmonds
<i>Industrial Relations – Will the European Community Change Everything?</i> | February 1994 |
| 6. | Olli Rehn
<i>The European Community and the Challenge of a Wider Europe</i> | July 1994 |
| 7. | Ulrich Sedelmeier
<i>The EU's Association Policy towards Central Eastern Europe: Political and Economic Rationales in Conflict</i> | October 1994 |
| 8. | Mary Kaldor
<i>Rethinking British Defence Policy and Its Economic Implications</i> | February 1995 |
| 9. | Alasdair Young
<i>Ideas, Interests and Institutions: The Politics of Liberalisation in the EC's Road Haulage Industry</i> | December 1994 |
| 10. | Keith Richardson
<i>Competitiveness in Europe: Cooperation or Conflict?</i> | December 1994 |
| 11. | Mike Hobday
<i>The Technological Competence of European Semiconductor Producers</i> | June 1995 |
| 12. | Graham Avery
<i>The Commission's Perspective on the Enlargement Negotiations</i> | July 1995 |
| 13. | Gerda Falkner
<i>The Maastricht Protocol on Social Policy: Theory and Practice</i> | September 1995 |
| 14. | Mary Kaldor
<i>Post-War Reconstruction in the Balkans</i> | June 1995 |
| 15. | Alasdair Smith, Peter Holmes, Ulrich Sedelmeier, Edward Smith,
Helen Wallace and Alasdair Young
<i>The European Union and Central and Eastern Europe: Pre-Accession Strategies</i> | March 1996 |
| 16. | Helen Wallace
<i>From an Island off the North-West Coast of Europe</i> | March 1996 |
| 17. | Indira Konjhodzic
<i>Democratic Consolidation of the Political System in Finland, 1945-1970: A Potential Model for the New States of Central and Eastern Europe?</i> | June 1996 |

18. Antje Wiener and Vince Della Sala December 1996
Constitution Making and Citizenship Practice - Bridging the Democracy Gap in the EU?
19. Helen Wallace and Alasdair Young December 1996
Balancing Public and Private Interests Under Duress
20. S. Ran Kim April 1997
The Evolution of Governance and the Growth Dynamics of the Korean Semiconductor Industry
21. Tibor Navracsics June 1997
A Missing Debate? Hungary and the European Union
22. Peter Holmes with Jeremy Kempton July 1997
Study on the Economic and Industrial Aspects of Anti-dumping Policy (£10)
23. Helen Wallace January 1998
Coming to Terms with a Larger Europe: Options for Economic Integration
24. Mike Hobday, Alan Cawson and S. Ran Kim January 1998
The Pacific Asian Electronics Industries: Technology Governance and Implications for Europe
25. Iain Begg August 1998
Structural Fund Reform in the Light of Enlargement
Centre on European Political Economy Working Paper No. 1
26. Mick Dunford and Adrian Smith August 1998
Trajectories of Change in Europe's Regions: Cohesion Divergence and Regional Performance
Centre on European Political Economy Working Paper No. 2
27. Ray Hudson August 1998
What Makes Economically Successful Regions in Europe Successful? Implications for Transferring Success from West to East
Centre on European Political Economy Working Paper No. 3
28. Adam Swain August 1998
Institutions and Regional Development: Evidence from Hungary and Ukraine
Centre on European Political Economy Working Paper No. 4
29. Alasdair Young August 1998
Interpretation and 'Soft Integration' in the Adaptation of the European Community's Foreign Economic Policy
Centre on European Political Economy Working Paper No. 5
30. Rilka Dragneva March 1999
Corporate Governance through Privatisation: Does Design Matter?
31. Christopher Preston and Arkadiusz Michonski March 1999
Negotiating Regulatory Alignment in Central Europe: The Case of the Poland EU European Conformity Assessment Agreement
32. Jeremy Kempton, Peter Holmes, Cliff Stevenson September 1999
Globalisation of Anti-Dumping and the EU
Centre on European Political Economy Working Paper No.6
33. Alan Mayhew March 2000
Financial and Budgetary Implications of the Accession of Central and East European Countries to the European Union.
34. Aleks Szczerbiak September 2000
Public Opinion and Eastward Enlargement
35. Keith Richardson October 2000
Big Business and the European Agenda

Each Working Paper is £5.00 (unless noted otherwise) plus £1.00 postage and packing per copy in Europe and £2.00 per copy elsewhere. Payment by credit card or cheque (payable to the University of Sussex).