



# *e*uroscope

Volume 29  
Summer 2004

# In this issue

<b>Editorial</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Michèle Harrison</i>	
<b>Co-directors Report,</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Prof. Jim Rollo</i>	
<b>The Europeanization Of Higher Education and Health Policies</b>	<b>6</b>
<i>Maria Cheiladaki-Liarokapi</i>	
<b>Submission information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Cultural Spirit in Kyiv: Working at the European Commission Ukraine</b>	<b>8</b>
<i>Dzmitry Sharko</i>	
<b>Contexts and Consequences. A conference in Memory of Edward Said</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Book Review: <i>The Natural History of Destruction</i>. WG Sebald</b>	<b>10</b>
<i>Andrea Dalton</i>	
<b>Nathalie Karagiannis: New Marie Curie Fellow in SEI</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>What are the perspectives of Southeastern Europe after EU Enlargement</b>	<b>12</b>
<i>Natasa Besirevic</i>	
<b>Research In Progress Seminar Timetable</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Wider Europe Programme. A Jean Monnet Seminar</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>In Brief</b>	<b>17</b>
<i>Aleks Szczerbiak</i>	
<b>Working Papers in Contemporary European Studies</b>	<b>18</b>

THE UNIVERSITY OF  
**SUSSEX**

**Sussex European Institute**

A Jean Monnet Centre of Excellence

A Marie Curie Research Training Site

**Arts Building**

**University of Sussex**

**Falmer**

**Brighton**

**BN1 9SH**

**Tel: +44 (0) 1273 678 578**

**Fax: +44 (0) 1273 678 571**

**sei@sussex.ac.uk**

**<http://www.sei.ac.uk>**

# euroscope

*the newsletter of the Sussex European Institute*

Summer 2004

Volume 29

## Editorial

### Plus ça change...

In this season of change I would like to welcome you to the Summer Edition 2004 of the Euroscope, with SEI moving locations in the University, the EU expanding and the West rapidly losing the 'peace' in Iraq, turbulence seems to be the normal state.

A change also at Euroscope, I have been joined in my editing tasks by Maria Cheiladaki-Liarokapi, a DPhil student in SEI, who has written an outline of her research project, and has ably assisted me in gathering other interesting articles for publication this time. Dzmitry Sharkov, a former SEI student, describes for us his experiences at the European Commission in the Ukraine, as well as aspects of living in Kyiv. Our new Marie Curie fellow in SEI, Nathalie Karagiannis gives us a short synopsis of her research interests while she is here, and Natasa Besirevic raises the issues of the integration of Southeastern Europe in the EU of the future, and the difficult questions this raises.

Jim Rollo gives us his perspective on the constitutional issue among the EU member states and an update on SEI's move into new quarters. Finally, we have a book review from Andrea Dalton of WG Sebald's *On the Natural History of Destruction*. Sebald's work is interesting to read in this time of ours, because he points out quite presciently (he died in 2001) that the inevitable destructions of war and the suffering of victims can become the end logic of waging war, rather than purely the means to a political or military result. It is something to contemplate as we watch Fallujah being destroyed in order to save it, and witness the Madrid bombings.

Michèle Harrison, Editor

## **Sussex European Institute Co-Directors Report**

### **Jim Rollo**

**T**he Summer term opens with a big change for SEI. By the time you read this the Institute will have moved from current accommodation, purpose built in 1992 for the newly founded SEI, to new rooms in the so-called Educational Development Building. This is a wrench for all concerned. The SEI building was a symbol of SEI for visitors and friends off campus as well as a focus for the academic community, staff, Masters, Diploma and Research students, around SEI. Alumni will remember A71 as a core for teaching and seminars. The new accommodation is in general fine for staff but there are no nearby teaching rooms and Research students will have a room a bit away from faculty. This will inevitably make it harder to sustain a community of Europeanists. The move is driven by the reorganisation of the school system in the University and whatever the benefits of that I feel that it is a mistake to risk the break up a functioning community in pursuit of bureaucratic tidiness. In the end however a successful organisation does not depend on bricks and mortar but on people. With hard work and enthusiasm we will sustain the spirit of SEI in a new place.

### **Madrid**

The Madrid bombings of 11 March were horrific in every sense and sympathy and solidarity goes to the Spanish people and to the victims and their families. And the reverberations are still being felt, in Iraq and in Europe. How far the bombings changed the outcome of the Spanish general election is a question for the psephologists but they are certainly perceived to have done so. At a stroke that unexpected election result changed the contours of 'Old Europe' and 'New Europe', revived the European Constitution (more on that below) and added even more force to the already rapidly intensifying European cooperation on anti-terrorism measures under JHA making many anxious about the impact on civil liberties. That is a lot of political impact from a single atrocity. The challenges for the EU and its members are immense. European co-operation is decidedly the key and it will have a real pay-off for the citizen if it makes them safer. But significant inroads to civil liberties in the name of security clearly has the risk of making matters worse not better.

### **On Constitutions and Referendums.**

Turning to more mundane politics the announcement of a British referendum on the Constitutional Treaty is one sign of how the Spanish election result has changed the political landscape. The backing off of first Spain and then Poland from their hard line stance on voting weights in the Council has opened the way for a successful IGC. That leaves Mr Blair with some political difficulties (the 'red lines@) since the Irish Presidency has said that it will take no account of any deals done in Brussels in December. It gives the Conservative opposition a subject on which to command headlines in the generally Europhobe British press for as long the IGC goes on (and that might stretch to the Dutch Presidency – will the Dutch run out of towns to name EU treaties after?). By announcing a commitment to a referendum Mr Blair both increases his bargaining power in the Council and potentially 'shoots the conservatives' fox' leaving them with one less thing that resonates with the voters to harry him over.

I have some sympathy with the original Blair stance that the Constitutional Treaty is not different in kind from

previous EU treaties albeit with some simplification and clarification of texts and a bit more flowery language. It certainly looks more like a treaty than a constitution. None the less calling it a constitution does raise the issue about how constitutional change should be ratified and given legitimacy and referendums are one rather traditional way of doing that – even in Britain. So, if the substantive case for a referendum looks relatively weak to me, the case built on political perceptions looks much stronger.

A Europe-wide referendum would be a better alternative than a series of national referendums each carrying the risk of vetoing the treaty. And there could be quite a few referendums. Ireland, Denmark, the Netherlands, Spain and Britain are now committed. Poland seem likely to hold one and France might also. With 25 brides having to say yes the potential for a car crash on the way to this particular wedding is thus high.

In terms of British politics winning a referendum on the Constitution could have the potential to put the subject of the benefits of UK membership of the EU to bed for a couple of decades as the 1975 referendum did. Losing it however could open the floodgates to calls for withdrawal from the right and the populist press. The more so since losing the Constitutional Treaty simply leaves us with the Treaty of Nice. Thus nothing would change as a result of a lost referendum which could increase popular dissatisfaction and give support to withdrawal. A lot is at stake on both sides of the British debate.

### **The Doha Development Agenda**

The lack of progress on the WTO negotiations since the failure at Cancun is extremely disappointing. And the blame lies largely with the EU and the traditional way of conducting these negotiations. The key is, as it always has been, agriculture. That is why the EU is central to progress. The mid-term review of the CAP gave some useful help to reaching a WTO agreement on domestic subsidies. It did little however on the most trade distorting measures of export subsidies and import barriers. To unlock the Round the EU has to signal some movement on these issues and also what it wants in return from other major players. But that is not how it is done traditionally. Everyone holds their cards close to their chest and then there is a very rapid and chaotic end-game in which everyone hopes that they will not give away too much in the heat of the action. Others are guilty along with the EU in this failure of collective action.

What is worse is that according to the Financial Times the EU is trying to break the coalition against it by offering the Mercosur members of the Cairns Group of agricultural exporters/Group of 20, and notably Brazil, increased agricultural market access under the proposed EU/Mercosur agreement in exchange for not pursuing removal of export subsidies and multilateral tariff reductions in the WTO. This is bad in two dimensions. First it removes the possibility of having a multilateral agricultural liberalisation that potentially means most to poor producers in developing countries. Second it uses preferential agreements to undermine the whole process of multilateral negotiation which is better for the world.

Enough, I will not write in the next Euroscope since I will be on leave and probably in Australia – which should give some new perspectives on Europe!

**JIM ROLLO**

# The Europeanization of Higher Education and Health Policies

Maria Cheiladaki-Liarokapi

The term *Europeanization* is a contested concept. For this reason further empirical research is needed in order to expand and improve existing knowledge about the process of Europeanization. By focusing on two policies (higher education and health) that are central to the nation-state but which at the same time have not europeanised to the degree that other national policies have, the research will provide a better understanding of the dynamics both at the European level and within individual member-states.

The expanding scope of the European Union (EU) agenda in higher education and health remains largely unexplored. The EU policies in these fields spread across a broad front of areas but at the same time they are subject to the principle of subsidiarity. On the other hand, the member-states are under pressure to respond to increasing public demands for better access to health services and to higher education qualifications. Yet, the member-states are uncertain as to how far they want to see the European Parliament and the European Commission becoming involved in these areas. The increasing EU involvement in higher education and health raise questions of legitimacy, effectiveness and appropriateness.

The research will be divided into two parts. The first part will explore the differential evolution of EU higher education and health policies. Health issues have featured in the Treaties since the earliest days of the European project. The European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC), was concerned with issues relating to the health and safety of workers in the steel and coal industries. With regards to higher education and although the general term “education” was missing from the original treaties, in 1963 two working groups were established within the Commission to reflect on future cooperation. However, the importance of higher education and health for the EU has developed more rapidly following the ratification of the Maastricht Treaty. The Treaty granted the Commission with specific legal competences to start work on both areas. It is worth noting that the EU’s formal competence in health was revised by the Treaty of Amsterdam.

The second part of the research will concentrate on the role played by Greece and Britain in the EU policy process with regards to higher education and health. The perceptions and positions of national governments and other key national actors about the EU involvement in higher education and health will be investigated along with the extent to which they have participated in the shaping of policy at the EU level but also at the implementation of the policies at the national level.

Within the area of EU higher education and health the research will focus on the issue of mobility though the use of two case-studies. The first case-study concerns the mobility of patients and the second the mobility of students. The promotion of student mobility through the Erasmus and later the Socrates programmes constitutes the core component of EU higher education policy. The Erasmus programme initiated for the first time in 1987, facilitated the creation of hundreds of networks within the higher education sector. This process led to the signing of the Bologna declaration between education ministers in 1999. On the other hand, the issue of patient mobility is a more recent development. Until 1998, the free movement provisions of Community law with regards to goods and services had an impact on the production of health care services. However, this situation changed following two court rulings of the

Court of Justice that affected the national provisions on the delivery of care to patients.

The study will provide a unique cross-sector and cross-country comparative framework. It will explain the nature of the EU higher education and health policies, their complexities and their future direction. It has to be acknowledged that EU policies in these fields have not yet affected substantial aspects of national higher education and health systems but they are in the process of doing so in the future. By taking into account the role of Greece and Britain it will be able to explore the interactive character of Europeanization in order to understand whether the growing involvement of the EU in these fields is the outcome of a learning process where national interests are reconsidered and where key political and institutional actors are given more opportunities to penetrate into new venues of policy-making.

*Maria Cheiladaki-Liarokapi is a research student at Sussex European Institute. She began her PhD in October 2003 and previous to her coming at Sussex University, she followed an MA in International Relations and European Studies and a BA in European Studies. During her under-graduate studies she was also given the opportunity to spend a year as an exchange student at Université de Mons-Hainaut in Belgium within the faculty of International Interpreters. Her work is supervised by Professor John Dearlove and Francis McGowan whose guidance for the past seven months has been central in identifying the conceptual and substantial aspects of her research. You can contact her at M. Cheiladaki-Liarokapi@sussex.ac.uk.*

## Submissions to Euroscope

You are welcomed and encouraged to send in short articles, book reviews, alumni news updates and more substantial articles to SEI and the Euroscope Journal. Please send your submission to EUROSCOPE@SUSSEX.AC.UK as Word attachments. Sorry we cannot accept hard copies. Short pieces should be 500 to 700 in length, book reviews 700 to 1000, and we would be pleased to see longer pieces on ongoing research from students of 1000 to 1500 as well. But you can also send alumni news and events of interest to SEI. All submissions will be edited for language and length.

Deadline for submissions by the end of the previous term, so Autumn Term for the Spring Issue, Spring for the Summer issue, and September 1<sup>st</sup> for the Autumn Term issue.

Sussex European Institute  
University of Sussex  
Falmer, Brighton  
BN1 9SH

44(0)1273 678 578 (Tel)

44(0)1273 678 571 (Fax)

sei@sussex.ac.uk  
euroscope@sussex.ac.uk  
<http://sei.ac.uk>

## **Cultural Spirit in Kyiv: Working at the European Commission in the Ukraine**

**Dzmitry Sharko**

**F**or the majority of SEI students September will raise a question of how to make the best use of the Sussex knowledge, how to get European work experience. For non-EU students of Western NIS this can become a problem. There is a widespread view that it is very difficult for them to get work experience in European Union institutions.

**One of [the delegation's] most important activities is informing the local public of developments in the European Union and to provide explanations of the individual EU policies.**

This problem was successfully resolved in my case. As a national of Belarus, I was lucky to get an internship opportunity in the European Commission's Delegation to the Ukraine, Moldova and Belarus, located in Kyiv, Ukraine.

From the point of view of work experience, this organisation has much to offer. On the one hand it is a branch of the European Commission, where a trainee can get very competitive knowledge of how the European Commission and its Directorates-General operate, and to witness how the European Union policies are implemented. On the other hand, the Delegation possesses the status of a diplomatic mission representing the European Commission and the European Union in the Ukraine, Moldova and Belarus. Thus, diplomatic experience in the external relations of the European Union will be a valuable contribution to the general EU expertise.

The Delegation actively operates in four broad fields. Its responsibility is to promote political and economic relations between the European Union and Ukraine, Moldova, and Belarus. The Delegation monitors the implementation of the Partnership and Cooperation Agreements between the EU and Ukraine, and between the EU and Moldova. One of its most important activities is informing the local public of developments in the European Union and to provide explanations of the individual EU policies. Also, the Delegation actively supervises the implementation of the EU Technical Assistance Programmes in these countries.

I guess it was because of strong Sussex academic background and general luck that I was placed in the analytical centre of the Delegation – the Political, Press and Information Section. In this department, accumulating data flows and disseminating information, I have a unique opportunity to apply my expertise in the European Union's relations with the Western NIS into practice. Also invaluable is the new experience in the fields of public relations, research and managing information. My responsibilities include information support and implementation of the EU-Ukraine projects and activities, publishing booklets and preparing presentations, participation in press briefings, managing the Delegation's website and many others.

The Delegation can boast of a fascinatingly friendly and supportive atmosphere. Here you can't help feeling that you are a full member of the team. Your colleagues, highly competent professionals, are looking forward to helping you develop



I have been working in the Delegation for three months now. This experience has convinced me that for a national of the Western NIS the professional training in the Delegation is as good as the one in Brussels. This is the EU experience that has immediate relevance to your country. You are doing a real work directly related to both the EU and your country, and your contribution is highly needed and appreciated by your colleagues. The unique knowledge and skills you develop in this environment are very competitive throughout all the countries of the region. But most important, is that working for the Delegation you always have a feeling of contributing to a better future and prospects of your country.

The Delegation is located in Kyiv, the capital, business and cultural centre of Ukraine. History lovers will admire its historical sites and exhibitions, museums and theatres which attract crowds of tourists from all over the world. Light and colourful, the city has managed to retain a cultural spirit and architectural authenticity of its own. Those who are vibrant and active will enjoy Kyiv as modern, posh and entertaining, offering all kinds of amusement, including many pubs, clubs and casinos. Those keen on cross-cultural communication will consider Ukrainians nice, smiling, sociable and open-minded. The impressions of Kyiv and Ukraine will greatly contribute to the training in the Delegation, making the experience truly multi-dimensional and very rewarding.

---

### EDWARD SAID CONTEXTS AND CONSEQUENCES ...

*A conference in memory of Edward Said, 1935-2003.*  
Friday, 14th May 2004, University of Sussex



**E**dward Said, Professor of English and Comparative Literature at Columbia University, New York, died in September 2003. His book, *Orientalism* (1978), is widely regarded as one of the key texts of the twentieth century and his political commitment to the cause of the Palestinian people marked him out as that rare combination of scholar-activist. The intention of the conference is not only to honour the intellectual achievements of Edward Said but also to address the ways in which his work has allowed us to re-think the disciplines that constitute academic life and to consider his political engagement.

The conference is an inter-disciplinary initiative that seeks to highlight the importance of postcolonial theory to our everyday understandings. Its intention is to examine the impact of postcolonial thought in different disciplines and address the contribution made by postcolonial thought to the wider academic and political world. Invitations to speak have been accepted by some of the leading international experts in the field and the event looks set to contain many challenging perspectives on Said as well as offering a fitting tribute to his work. The importance of such an event ought not be taken lightly for, as one of the invited speakers commented herself, it is very rare for there to be a conference devoted exclusively to postcolonial theory.

*Sponsored by: The School of Humanities and  
The School of Social Sciences & Cultural Studies*  
*Organisers: Gurminder K. Bhambra, Mark Digiacomio, Nisha Jones, Timo Juetten*  
*For further information please email [said@sussex.ac.uk](mailto:said@sussex.ac.uk)*

**“On Closed Eyes and Averted Gazes”  
A Review of *The Natural History of Destruction* by**

*Publishing information. 2004 Penguin Books £ 8.99 Translator: Anthea Bell  
ISBN: 0-140-29800-2*

**W.G. Sebald**

**Andrea Dalton**

**T**his posthumous collection of essays, translated from the German by Anthea Bell, includes *Air War and Literature*, based on Sebald's Zürich lectures given in 1997 and comments on works by Alfred Andersch and Jean Améry and offers a critical, albeit brief, analysis of the works of Peter Weiss. The most compelling of these four essays, in my view, is concerned with the way in which German writers have responded to the issue of air raids on Germany with a kind of national amnesia. In this, Sebald focusses on literature's reaction to the destruction and annihilation of whole towns and cities – or rather the lack thereof. Sebald clearly criticises the mainly passive reaction of the Germans to the loss of their cities: “That silence, that reserve, that instinctive looking away are the reasons why we know so little of what the Germans thought and observed in the five years between 1942 and 1947.” How can it be, Sebald asks, that Great Britain vigorously debated the program of destruction from the first and that pictures of area bombing in England spurned revulsion against the damage that had been – so to speak – indiscriminately inflicted, while on the home front even the alarming increase of parasitical creatures thriving on the unburied bodies during the weeks after the air raid merited no mention.

Sebald was born in 1944, in Wertach, in Allgäu and grew up amid the ruins of Germany. His experience is that of post-war memory, his search for a true depiction of the events of the air raids given in the testimony of writers proved futile. His accusation, then, is aimed at those directly affected by the experience and their failure to pass their insights on to the next generation – the experience of destruction has never really found verbal expression.

The three shorter essays included in this collection deal with authors whose World War II experiences inform their writing, albeit most of the works discussed are fundamentally autobiographical. Alfred Andersch, the first of the authors, is clearly portrayed as an example of failure – namely in reference to his compromise on literature and refusal deal with his experiences in a more ‘honest’ way.

One of Sebald's primary concerns with the works of the novelist Alfred Andersch lies with the absence of plain facts, concrete memories and details. What he is looking for is a “steadfast gaze bent on reality”, hence the concrete and detailed introduction to his own work: “German civilians fell victim to the air raids and 3.5 million

homes were destroyed, while at the end of the war 7.5 million people were left homeless, and there where 31.1 cubic metres of rubble for everyone in Cologne and 42.8 cubic metres for every inhabitant of Dresden (...).” The caustic heading to the essay itself foreshadows Sebald’s criticism: “In Alfred Andersch, German literature has discovered one of its soundest and most individual talents. Alfred Andersch, book jacket text written by himself.”

**“That silence, that reserve, that instinctive looking away are the reasons why we know so little of what the Germans thought and observed in the five years between 1942 and 1947.”**

The second essay deals with the concentration camp survivor Jean Amery. Sebald’s criticism looks more favourably upon the works of Amery, whose centrepiece of writing is based on the destruction inflicted on him and those like him. Amery’s philosophical position serves, in Sebald’s view, as a continuation of protest, “a dimension so strikingly lacking from German post-war literature.”

In the final essay on Peter Weiss, Sebald highlights the reliance on authenticity and the essential interplay between memory and experience. “The artistic self also engages personally in such a reconstruction, pledging itself, as Weiss sees it, to set up a memorial, and the painful nature of that process could

be said to ensure the continuancy (sic) of memory.”

Many of the themes in this collection of essays appear in other works by Sebald, such as his childhood play amongst the debris of destruction, which reoccurs in his book *Vertigo* (Schwindel. Gefühle), though in a rather more subtle and suggestive way.

I would anticipate two main criticisms on *On the Natural History of Destruction*: The first being an obvious paradox, in that Sebald on the one hand makes it clear that the sheer horror of having lived through the air raids has inflicted a paralysis on it’s survivors, an inability to articulate the experience. On the other hand Sebald condemns literatures the lack of facts and details concerning those experiences.

The second criticism may be more of an unnerving observation: the realisation that Sebald’s academic essays take on a much ‘harder’ tone and thus stand in stark contrast to the mesmeric and suggestive style which has become his signature.

Nevertheless, this book is destined to initiate critical debate and open up timely discussions. Ultimately, thus, Sebald has achieved what he set out to do: To deny us the licence to close our eyes and avert our gaze.

***Andrea Dalton is reading for a DPhil in Modern European Literature on W.G. Sebald***

I joined Sussex as a Marie Curie Fellow last March. The institution hosting me here is the SEI and I will be working with William Outhwaite. For the two coming years, the EU grant I was awarded will enable me to research a project focusing on the concept of solidarity. The project investigates the uses of this concept in two European policies: one that addresses the internal European affairs, social affairs, and one that predominantly addresses the external relations of the European Union, humanitarian aid policy. The research will be carried in an interdisciplinary manner, combining insights from social theory and political philosophy with

**New Marie Curie Fellow in SEI  
Nathalie Karagiannis**

discourse analysis and history. Whilst the treatment of theoretical issues relates to existing works in the relevant areas, its empirical findings are meant to contribute to a larger debate on political Europe by making a

sophisticated reflection on solidarity more accessible.

My previous research looked at the EU development policy from a social- and political-theoretical perspective: in the framework of the contractual relations between the ACP countries the European Community, I had taken particular interest in the historical evolutions of the concepts of responsibility (hierarchical, egalitarian, 'global'), efficiency (economic and political), and giving (gift, debt and market exchange).

Other current areas of interest are related to the American self-understanding and the United States' foreign policy, the rethinking of the relation between the social and the political and time, history and the tragic idea.

I hold the PhD of the European University Institute in Florence, the Diplôme of the Institut d'Etudes Politiques (Sciences-Po) in Paris, and the Maîtrise de Droit Public of the Université Paris I Panthéon-Sorbonne. My publications include *Avoiding Responsibility: the Politics and Discourse of the EU Development Policy* (2004, London: Pluto), *Rethinking the Social and the Political: Towards a Theory of Synagonism*, with Peter Wagner (forthcoming, 2005), 'Preceding Global Responsibility: Power, Autonomy, Knowledge' in Mike Davis et al. (eds): *International Intervention in the Post-Cold War World: Moral Responsibility and Power Politics* (New York: M.E. Sharpe, 2003), 'Die Gabe in der Entwicklungspolitik' in Frank Adloff and Steffen Mau, *Reziprozität. Zur Soziologie des Gebens und Nehmens* (Frankfurt: Campus Verlag, forthcoming, 2005). **Contact information: nathalie.karagiannis@iue.it**

**What are the perspectives of Southeastern Europe after the EU Enlargement in 2004?**

**Natasa Besirevic**

In the light of the EU Eastern enlargement in May 2004, it became apparent that enlargement instruments cannot be fully applied and would not produce similar results in the neighbourhood region of a "Wider Europe". Conversely, enlargement incentives in the European integration process are increasingly being applied to the region of Southeastern Europe. The recent events in Kosovo where at least 31 people were killed in two days of atrocities between Serbs and the ethnic Albanian majority and the rise of the nationalist parties as a result of the elections in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia and Serbia-Montenegro showed that the current process of reform and integration is particularly vulnerable. As EU Commissioner Chris Patten once said: "This corner of our continent remains volatile, and at any moment any part of it can still topple into crisis."

EU officials also agreed that the map of the European Union would not be complete until it includes the countries of the Western Balkans. Still, the questions remain: What would the role of the Western Balkan be in the enlarged Union? Would Balkan countries remain important as a region even outside the European Union? Does the EU have a proper strategy for this part of Europe? Is this strategy successful, or does the conflict in Kosovo portend a second decade of war? There is no doubt that the countries of Southeastern Europe want to become members of the EU, but the question is whether they would all become members at the same time or would the accession be on individual basis?

These are just some of the issues I will try to discuss in my dissertation with the draft title of 'The perspectives of Southeastern Europe after the EU enlargement 2004'. The relationship between the EU and the region of Southeastern Europe had two phases: the period from 1990 until 2000 and the relations after the democratic changes. Those changes took place in 2000 when nationalist parties lost their power after the decade of wars and turbulent events. In the 1990s, the European Union's relations with the western Balkan region

focused on crisis management and reconstruction, reflecting the countries' emergency needs at that time. The European Community's assistance programmes to these countries were substantial, totalling some €5.5 billion. In 1999 the EU's fundamental aim for South East Europe was to create a situation where military conflict is unthinkable – establish lasting peace in the region, stability, prosperity and freedom achieved during last 50 years by the EU. That's why the EU launched the Stabilisation and Association Process (SAP) in 1999 which is now the cornerstone of its policy towards the western Balkan region. The SAP involved preferential trade concessions and a new contractual relationship of reform assistance; the Stabilization and Association Agreement (SAA). The legitimacy of the EU's relationship of regulation is based on two grounds, the promise of aid and of EU membership at some point in the future. SAP is designed to encourage and support the domestic reform processes within these countries in a step-by-step approach based on aid, trade preferences, dialogue, technical advice and, ultimately, contractual relations. The next step, for countries that have made sufficient progress in terms of political and economic reform and administrative capacity, is a formal contractual relationship with the EU. So far, Croatia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia have signed such agreements and already applied for the full EU membership. Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia and Montenegro and Albania have not entered the procedure yet. They have not even started with the SAA negotiations. Even such contractual relations with the EU clearly show the differences in the region. While Croatia in forthcoming months expects to receive avis – the opinion of the European Commission for candidacy status and fulfilled about 80% of the SAA, Serbia still didn't get 'green light' about Feasibility Study; the first step towards the SAA. Therefore, is the same approach to all five countries in the region possible and are the suggestions about the Balkan Federations that occasionally accrue justified? Should the EU strategy towards this part of Europe be completely changed?

In this dissertation it will be argued that the EU policy towards South Eastern Europe shouldn't be changed completely, because it takes time, money and political consensus which can be very difficult to achieve in EU 25. But, postponing the candidate status for the SEE states, whose recent history was marked with the rule of the nationalist parties coming to power again, can be potentially dangerous for this part of Europe. It could lead to euro scepticism among political elites and 'wide masses', which could form the opinion: why do we need the EU, if the path towards the Union lasts so long? Giving the clearer perspective of the EU membership and better understanding of the EU policy towards that part of Europe is crucial. The topic of this dissertation will be discussed through the issues of the relationship history between western Balkans and the EU, political institutional framework of the EU towards SEE after changes in the region in 2000, difficulties in applying the EU conditions in the western Balkans and the ways of improving them. The emphasis would be put on the fulfilling the political and economic Copenhagen criteria, that is the stability of institutions, administrative capacity building, the rule of law and human rights, the existence of a functioning market economy as well as the capacity to cope with competitive pressure within the Union; together with the ability to take on the obligations of membership including adherence to the aims of political, economic and monetary union. In the case of the western Balkan, issues such as refugees' return, judiciary reform, cooperation with the ICTY and regional cooperation are included. The overview towards EU policy will also include Common Foreign and Security Policy in the western Balkans.

I would try to analyse all these questions with the assistance of my tutor, Alan Mayhew, who is one of the reasons I picked this topic for my dissertation. Namely that, Mr. Mayhew is one of the advisors to the Croatian Government and within Ministry of the European Integration, where I work, is known as a respected expert. That was the reason for me to pick the course 'EU enlargement and accession' lectured by Mr. Mayhew and Prof Rollo. Their lectures opened whole new perspectives on the enlargement issues and on this particular issue. During my visit to the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) I asked Mr Chris Cviic, senior political advisor originally from Croatia to be my second mentor. I'm hoping that with their assistance I would be able to reach several EU officials that are deeply involved in these issues. Despite all the difficulties in this region I strongly believe that the only path for this part of Europe will be the EU, and that with my dissertation I hope to contribute to a better understanding of why a United Europe is the best way.

## SEI RESEARCH IN PROGRESS SEMINARS

Summer Term 2004

Tuesdays 2.15 - 3.50 pm - Room A7I, SEI

- 20th April 2004      **Soledad Garcia** (Barcelona University )  
*European Employment Policy:  
Multi-level Governance and Social Dialogue in EU Member States*
- 27th April 2004      **Prof Alan Mayhew, Prof Jorg Monar, Prof Jim Rollo,  
Dr Aleks Szczerbiak** (SEI)  
*SEI Roundtable on “the 2004 EU Enlargement”*
- 4th May 2004        **Professor Jörg Monar** (Sussex European Institute)  
*Anti-terrorism in the EU after the Madrid bombings*
- 11th May 2004      **Ilias Meintanis** (Sussex European Institute)  
*The Europeanisation of Immigration Policy in Greece:  
the Limits of Framing Mechanisms*
- 18th May 2004      **Dr Yasemin Soysal** (University of Essex)  
*European Citizenship*
- 25th May 2004      **Professor Anand Menon** (University of Birmingham European Research  
Institute)  
*The EU’s Security and Defence Policy After Iraq*
- 1st June 2004        **Francis McGowan** (University of Sussex)  
*Governing the EU Economy: Models and Mechanisms*
- 8th June 2004        **Jim Mathis** (University of Amsterdam)  
*The EU’s External Regional Policy*
- 22nd June 2004      *SEI End of Year Party*

**Jean Monnet Seminar: European Near Neighbourhood  
4-5 June 2004**

**The seminar will concentrate on relations with Eastern Europe, and especially Ukraine and Belarus, in the context of enlargement.**

**Background**

Ukraine and Belarus have signed Partnership and Cooperation Agreements with the European Union. The agreement with Belarus has been suspended by the Union side. Neither of these countries has unequivocally requested accession to the Union and the EU has not offered even eventual accession.

These PCAs vary somewhat between Ukraine and Belarus but the agreements include:

- o Political dialogue
- o Trade and establishment
- o Competition policy and intellectual property rights
- o Financial support

The Union has also agreed a 'Common Strategy' for Ukraine, which in some ways goes beyond the PCA but has the disadvantage that it is a unilateral strategies not agreed with Ukraine.

Union policy towards these countries is however evolving fast. The Commission has produced two significant papers in 2003 affecting relations with Eastern Europe: the first on 'Wider Europe' dealt with relations with all neighbouring countries, including the Mediterranean rim; the second proposed improvements to the funding of regions on either side of the external frontier of the Union after enlargement and the creation of a 'New Neighbourhood Instrument' after 2006. A 'Wider Europe' task force has also been established in the Commission.

Action Plans are being drawn up in the Commission for each of the countries covered by the 'Wider Europe' initiative and that for the Ukraine is expected to be submitted in the near future.

The objectives of the Conference are to explore three main issues:

- o The impact of enlargement on the internal and external policies of these countries
- o The development of 'Neighbourhood Policy' in the Union and the impact of enlargement on this policy
- o The outlook for these countries in the context of JHA and economic policies in the Union

and to attempt answers at certain key questions:

- o How much leverage can the Union have in these countries when accession to the Union is expressly excluded for the present?
- o How much integration will the Union offer and how much integration will the countries seek?
- o How much political and economic reform is necessary for deeper integration with the Union and what are the internal barriers to this reform?

**For more information and a registration form please contact: Nathaniel  
Copsey at  
n.w.copsey@sussex.ac.uk**

## **Jean Monnet Seminar: European Near Neighbourhood**

Friday June 4th:

10.00-10.15

*Welcome and Introduction: Jim Rollo\*, Chairman and Leader of East Sussex County Council\**

10.15-11.15

*Post-Enlargement EU policy towards Eastern Europe: Michael Leigh\*, Kim Darroch\**

11.15-11.30

*Coffee*

11.30-13.00

*The impact of EU enlargement on Relations between Accession Countries and their Neighbours:  
Judy Batt\*, Pawel Swieboda\*, Nat Copsey\**

13.00-14.00

*Lunch*

14.00-15.30

*Political and economic reform in Ukraine and Belarus: DHM Ihor Prokopchuk\*, Andrew Wilson\**

15.30-15.45

*Coffee*

15.45-17.30

*Round Table: Michael Leigh\*, Ihor Prokopchuk\*, Roger Liddle\*, Danuta Hübner\*, Alan Mayhew (Chair)\**

17.30

**Close of first day**

19.30

*Dinner in Brighton: Keynote speaker, Danuta Hübner\**

**Saturday June 5th**

9.30-10.45

*Economic policy and economic reform in Eastern Europe: Jim Rollo\**

11-13

*JHA and relations with Eastern Europe: Jörg Monar\*, Iwona Piórko\**

13.00

**Close**



**'In Brief'**  
**Aleks Szczerbiak**

*January 13th* – chaired SEI Research in Progress seminar roundtable on 'Who killed the European Constitution?'

*March 5th* - "Politics in the New Europe: Poland," *Sussex European Institute seminar on Living in a Union of 25: Challenges of the New Europe*, 5 March 2004

*April 15th* – interviewed by BBC Radio West Midlands for the 'Poles Apart' programme.

**Publications**

Wrote the "Political Developments" section for the Economist Intelligence Unit March 2003 Country Report and May 2003 Country Forecast

"Polish Euroscepticism in the Run Up to EU Accession," *European Studies*, forthcoming, January/February 2004

(with Paul Taggart) "Contemporary Euroscepticism in the Party Systems of the EU Candidate States of Central and Eastern Europe," *European Journal of Political Research*, Vol 43, January 2004

(with Paul Taggart) "Supporting the Union? Euroscepticism and Domestic Politics of European Integration" in Maria Green Cowles and Desmond Dinan, eds, *Developments in European Union Politics* 2, forthcoming, 2004

(with Sean Hanley), ed. *Centre-Right Parties in Post-Communist East-Central Europe: Special Issue of the Journal of Communist Studies and Transition Politics*, forthcoming, September 2004

"The Polish Centre-Right's (Last) Best Hope: The Rise and Fall of Solidarity Electoral Action," in Aleks Szczerbiak and Sean Hanley eds. *Centre-Right Parties in Post-Communist East-Central Europe: Special Issue of the Journal of Communist Studies and Transition Politics*, forthcoming, September 2004

(with Paul Taggart), ed. *The EU Accession Referendums: Special Issue of West European Politics*, forthcoming, September 2004

"The June 2003 Polish EU Accession Referendum" in Aleks Szczerbiak and Paul Taggart, eds. *The EU Accession Referendums: Special Issue of West European Politics*, forthcoming, September 2004

Working Papers in Contemporary European Studies

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, Peter Holmes February 1994  
*Competition, Collaboration & Public Policy: A Case Study of the European HDTV Strategy*
4. Colin Crouch February 1994  
*The Future of Unemployment in Western Europe? Reconciling Demands for Flexibility, Quality and Security*
5. John Edmonds February 1994  
*Industrial Relations - Will the European Community Change Everything?*
6. Olli Rehn July 1994  
*The European Community and the Challenge of a Wider Europe*
7. Ulrich Sedelmeier October 1994  
*The EU's Association Policy towards Central Eastern Europe: Political and Economic Rationales in Conflict*
8. Mary Kaldor February 1995  
*Rethinking British Defence Policy and Its Economic Implications*
9. Alasdair Young December 1994  
*Ideas, Interests and Institutions: The Politics of Liberalisation in the EC's Road Haulage Industry*
10. Keith Richardson December 1994  
*Competitiveness in Europe: Cooperation or Conflict?*
11. Mike Hobday June 1995  
*The Technological Competence of European Semiconductor Producers*
12. Graham Avery July 1995  
*The Commission's Perspective on the Enlargement Negotiations*
13. Gerda Falkner September 1995  
*The Maastricht Protocol on Social Policy: Theory and Practice*
14. Vesna Bojicic, Mary Kaldor, Ivan Vejvoda November 1995  
*Post-War Reconstruction in the Balkans*
15. Alasdair Smith, Peter Holmes, Ulrich Sedelmeier, Edward Smith, Helen Wallace, Alasdair Young March 1996  
*The European Union and Central and Eastern Europe: Pre-Accession Strategies*

## *Euroscope Volume 29 Summer*

16. Helen Wallace  
*From an Island off the North-West Coast of Europe* March 1996
17. Indira Konjhodzic  
*Democratic Consolidation of the Political System in Finland, 1945-1970:  
Potential Model for the New States of Central and Eastern Europe?* June 1996
18. Antje Wiener and Vince Della Sala  
*Constitution Making and Citizenship Practice - Bridging the Democracy Gap  
in the EU?* December 1996
19. Helen Wallace and Alasdair Young  
*Balancing Public and Private Interests Under Duress* December 1996
20. S. Ran Kim  
*Evolution of Governance & the Growth Dynamics of the Korean Semiconductor  
Industry* April 1997
21. Tibor Navracsics  
*A Missing Debate?: Hungary and the European Union* June 1997
22. Peter Holmes with Jeremy Kempton  
*Study on the Economic and Industrial Aspects of Anti-Dumping Policy* September 1997
23. Helen Wallace  
*Coming to Terms with a Larger Europe: Options for Economic Integration* January 1998
24. Mike Hobday, Alan Cawson and S Ran Kim  
*The Pacific Asian Electronics Industries: Technology Governance  
and Implications for Europe* January 1998
25. Iain Begg  
*Structural Fund Reform in the Light of Enlargement*  
Centre on European Political Economy Working Paper No. 1 August 1998
26. Mick Dunford and Adrian Smith  
*Trajectories of Change in Europe's Regions: Cohesion,  
Divergence and Regional Performance*  
Centre on European Political Economy Working Paper No. 2 August 1998
27. Ray Hudson  
*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 August 1998
28. Adam Swain  
*Institutions and Regional Development: Evidence from Hungary and Ukraine*  
Centre on European Political Economy Working Paper No. 4 August 1998
29. Alasdair Young  
*Interpretation and 'Soft Integration' in the Adaptation of the European  
Community's Foreign Economic Policy*  
Centre on European Political Economy Working Paper No. 5 October 1998
30. Rilka Dragneva  
*Corporate Governance Through Privatisation: Does Design Matter?* March 1999

## *Euroscope Volume 29 Summer 2004*

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 May 2000  
*Public Opinion and Eastward Enlargement - Explaining Declining Support for EU Membership in Poland*
35. Keith Richardson September 2000  
*Big Business and the European Agenda*
36. Aleks Szczerbiak and Paul Taggart October 2000  
*Opposing Europe: Party Systems and Opposition to the Union, the Euro and Europeanisation*  
'Opposing Europe Research Network' Working Paper No. 1
37. Alasdair Young, Peter Holmes and Jim Rollo November 2000  
*The European Trade Agenda After Seattle*
38. Sławomir Tokarski and Alan Mayhew December 2000  
*Impact Assessment and European Integration Policy*
39. Alan Mayhew December 2000  
*Enlargement of the European Union: an Analysis of the Negotiations with the Central and Eastern European Candidate Countries*
40. Pierre Jacquet and Jean Pisani-Ferry January 2001  
*Economic Policy Co-ordination in the Eurozone: What has been achieved? What should be done?*
41. Joseph F. Francois and Machiel Rombout February 2001  
*Trade Effects From The Integration Of The Central And East European Countries Into The European Union*
42. Peter Holmes and Alasdair Young February 2001  
*Emerging Regulatory Challenges to the EU's External Economic Relations*
43. Michael Johnson March 2001  
*EU Enlargement and Commercial Policy: Enlargement and the Making of Commercial Policy*
44. Witold Orłowski and Alan Mayhew May 2001  
*The Impact of EU Accession on Enterprise, Adaptation and Insitutional Development in the Countries of Central and Eastern Europe*
45. Adam Lazowski May 2001  
*Adaptation of the Polish legal system to European Union law: Selected aspects*

## *Euroscope Volume 29 Summer*

46. Paul Taggart and Aleks Szczerbiak May 2001  
*Parties, Positions and Europe: Euroscepticism in the EU Candidate States of Central and Eastern Europe*  
'Opposing Europe Research Network' Working Paper No. 2
47. Paul Webb and Justin Fisher May 2001  
*Professionalizing the Millbank Tendency: the Political Sociology of New Labour's Employees*
48. Aleks Szczerbiak June 2001  
*Europe as a Re-aligning Issue in Polish Politics?: Evidence from the October 2000 Presidential Election*  
'Opposing Europe Research Network' Working Paper No. 3
49. Agnes Batory September 2001  
*Hungarian Party Identities and the Question of European Integration*  
'Opposing Europe Research Network' Working Paper No. 4
50. Karen Henderson September 2001  
*Euroscepticism or Europhobia: Opposition attitudes to the EU in the Slovak Republic*  
'Opposing Europe Research Network' Working Paper No. 5.
51. Paul Taggart and Aleks Szczerbiak April 2002  
*The Party Politics of Euroscepticism in EU Member and Candidate States*  
'Opposing Europe Research Network' Working Paper No. 6.
52. Alan Mayhew April 2002  
*The Negotiating Position of the European Union on Agriculture, the Structural Funds and the EU Budget.*
53. Aleks Szczerbiak May 2002  
*After the Election, Nearing The Endgame: The Polish Euro-Debate in the Run Up To The 2003 EU Accession Referendum*  
'Opposing Europe Research Network' Working Paper No. 7.
54. Charlie Lees June 2002  
*'Dark Matter': institutional constraints and the failure of party-based Euroscepticism in Germany.*  
'Opposing Europe Research Network' Working Paper No. 8.
55. Pinar Tanlak October 2002  
*Turkey EU Relations in the Post Helsinki phase and the EU harmonisation laws adopted by the Turkish Grand National Assembly in August 2002*
56. Nick Sitter October 2002  
*Opposing Europe: Euro-Scepticism, Opposition and Party Competition*  
'Opposing Europe Research Network' Working Paper No. 9.
57. Hans G Nilsson November 2002  
*Decision Making in EU Justice and Home Affairs: Current Shortcomings and Reform Possibilities*
58. Adriano Giovannelli November 2002  
*Semipresidentialism: an emerging pan-European model*

## *Euroscope Volume 29 Summer 2004*

59. Daniel Naurin  
*Taking Transparency Seriously* December 2002
60. Lucia Quaglia  
*Eurocepticism in Italy and centre Right and Right wing political parties.*  
'Opposing Europe Research Network' Working Paper No. 10. March 2003
61. Francesca Vassallo  
*Another Europeanisation Case: British Political Activism* March 2003
62. Kieran Williams, Aleks Szczerbiak, Bridgid Fowler  
*Explaining Lustration in Eastern Europe : a Post-Communist Politics Approach* March 2003
63. Rasa Spokeviciute  
*The Impact of EU Membership of The Lithuanian Budget* March 2003
64. Clive Church  
*The Contexts of Swiss Opposition to Europe* May 2003
65. Alan Mayhew  
*The Financial and Budgetary Impact of Enlargement and Accession* May 2003
66. Przemysław Biskup  
*Conflicts Between Community and National Laws: An Analysis of the British Approach* June 2003
67. Eleonora Crutini  
*Evolution of Local Systems in the Context of Enlargement* August 2003
68. Professor Jim Rollo  
*Agriculture, the Structural Funds and the Budget After Enlargement* August 2003
66. Przemysław Biskup  
*Conflicts Between Community and National Laws: An Analysis of the British Approach* June 2003
67. Eleonora Crutini  
*Evolution of Local Systems in the Context of Enlargement* August 2003
68. Professor Jim Rollo  
*Agriculture, the Structural Funds and the Budget After Enlargement* August 2003

## *Euroscope Volume 29 Summer*

69. Aleks Szczerbiak and Paul Taggart October 2003  
*Theorising Party-Based Euroscepticism: Problems of Definition, Measurement and Causality*  
'European Parties Elections and Referendums Network' Working Paper No. 12
70. Nicolo Conti November 2003  
*Party Attitudes to European Integration: A Longitudinal Analysis of the Italian Case*  
'European Parties Elections and Referendums Network' Working Paper No. 13
71. Paul Lewis November 2003  
*The Impact of the Enlargement of the European Union on Central European Party Systems*  
'European Parties Elections and Referendums Network' Working Paper No. 14
72. Jonathan P Aus December 2003  
*Supranational Governance in an "Area of Freedom, Security and Justice": Eurodac and the Politics of Biometric Control*
73. Juraj Buzalka February 2004  
*Is Rural Populism on the decline? Continuities and Changes in Twentieth Century Europe: The case of Slovakia*

All Working Papers are downloadable free of charge from the web - [www.sei.ac.uk](http://www.sei.ac.uk)

Otherwise, 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 'University of Sussex')