Editorial

I’ve noticed lately that there is quite a rash of ‘newness’ around – we have locally, a new term of course, but also this year, new schools, new structures, new curriculum. Further afield the focus of SEI is around grasping the changes, in ways political, economic, sociological and anthropological, of a ‘New Europe’ about to burst into existence in May 2004 with the entry of the accession candidates into the EU which will thence be - new. But is ‘new’ the new “new”? The fresh au courant term for modern, as was? It is certainly sounds a bit fluffier, not quite so embedded with the concepts of rupture, or disjuncture, or a break with the past and with tradition that seems to afflict the term modernity these days. In both contexts here, new also means enlargement, enhancement, a gathering in of disparate previously existing elements. So the accession candidates not only become part of the ‘new’ Europe but also make that newness as they enter through the EU doorway. I realized, though, how pervasive the conflation between the idea of an EU Europe, and the old geographical Europe was, when a man in Prague told me he was quite happy for his children to be Europeans in the future.

So what of the old? However much we peg ‘new’ to things, some things should and do remain. So here at the Euroscoope you will find some of the familiar pieces. Jim Rollo gives us his latest co-directors report, explaining some of the changes afoot in the University and those contemplated in the EU. Aleks Szczepaniak and Paul Taggart update us on the OERN, which has undergone a transformation to EPERN. Liljana Rek delivers the last of the MACES reports and we have a number of alumni reports and news from previous MACES students. You can also find a list of the Working Papers in SEI available for downloading or purchase by snail mail. Aleks also keeps us up to date with ‘In Brief’ and new publications. And more, including a word from the Dean and Viga’s Friends of SEI. Finally, I am also new, taking over from Nick and Pontus as editor, to both of whom a warm thank you should be given for their work in producing Euroscoope for the last couple of years.

Michèle Harrison
Welcome to Sussex from what I hope has been an enjoyable and productive vacation! Obviously, there have been some major changes since last term. The old Schools have been replaced by the new Schools, with SEI now located in the School of Social Sciences and Cultural Studies and responsibility for an undergraduate programme in Contemporary European studies as well as its postgraduate programmes. As well as Deans, the new Schools will have Directors of Graduate Studies, Undergraduate Studies, and Student Support. In addition, there will be a number of professional student advisers to provide guidance and support.

There will inevitably be some disruption. Many people have moved offices as part of the first stage in locating the new Schools in their designated space – Humanities in Arts A and B and SocCul a little more dispersed across Arts C, D, E and EDB. SEI is scheduled to move some time in the new academic year (most likely at Easter). There will be building work taking place over the next few years to create new entrances, larger common rooms and School offices. There will also be a new lecture and seminar room building on the car park alongside Bramber House, which will replace the temporary classrooms that have appeared at the back of Arts D.

Although there have been many changes, much will remain the same. You will be taught by many of the staff who taught you before, though they will be joined by many new faces, following a very successful recruitment of new academic staff during the summer term. Many of the support and administrative staff will also be the same; there will be some familiar faces in familiar roles, but also some familiar faces in new roles. The spirit of the old Schools will remain in the new Schools, even if there will be some wrinkles that will need to be ironed out at first. There is the same commitment to the success of SEI within SocCul as there was within Euro.

Importantly, there will be the same commitment to interdisciplinarity for which Sussex is well-known. The new curriculum across the School incorporates many of the courses from the old School system. For example, SocCul will be running four interdisciplinary programmes (or IDPEs) in Contemporary European Studies, Cultural Studies, Gender Studies, and Development Studies. These will exist as joint degrees, alongside a wide selection of other joint degrees across subjects and a new range of single honours degrees. Students who are entering to take a single honours degree will take part of their degree as an elective where they will select courses from the other programmes. We remain just as committed to the ‘old’ curriculum, precisely because so much of it will continue in the new curriculum. The new degree programmes in which this curriculum is now being packaged has proven very popular, with the humanities and social sciences enjoying their most successful recruitment of new undergraduates for a number of years.

We will also be keen to build on and expand our postgraduate activities. SEI research students have been successful in the recent ESRC studentship competition, but, equally important, applicants to Sussex gained 27 awards this year, which places the University among the top institutions nationally.

I am looking forward to a positive year in which Sussex and SEI build on their past strengths and I am pleased to welcome you as part of this new venture.
Apart from the inexorable rhythm of the academic year, universities are rather evolutionary institutions. Sometimes the changes taking place are almost invisible to staff and students. That is not true this year. Sussex is going through big bang change; new schools, new curricula, new buildings. For SEI some of the changes are low key and superficial. We are now a department – which should change little in how faculty operate and teaching is delivered. We are part of the School of Social Science and Cultural Studies, which will make a difference to the student experience since some administrative functions that were carried out in SEI will move to the new school office and the graduate school. When we know what they are the Euroscope will be the first to be told! Most important of all SEI has changed from only delivering postgraduate training and research to having an undergraduate cohort in Contemporary European Studies.

So into this maelstrom of change let me welcome our new Doctoral students, our new students in the MAs in Contemporary European Studies, European Law and Society and European Politics as well as our very first cohort on the undergraduate interdisciplinary programme in Contemporary European Studies.

What is unchanging and unchangeable is the commitment of SEI staff to the quality of the courses we deliver and of the student experience.

In the wider world, the nature of Europe is in flux. The EU is now committed to expanding from 15 to 25 members next May. All of the new members have had referenda in which their populations have overwhelmingly (Malta apart) if not always enthusiastically approved membership.

The Convention on the Future of Europe produced a draft constitution for the new European Union in July after 17 months of work. The work of the convention was remarkable in as much as it produced a single document adopted by consensus. For many, however, the document is a damp squib. More a tidying up than the basis of a new European polity with its own demos. For others it goes too far in embedding power in Brussels and opens too many possibilities of creeping centralization. Inevitably, it reflects political compromise. The one unambiguous winner from the draft constitution is the European Parliament which is offered increased legislative powers over a wide range of EU policy. The Council of ministers representing the member states has also been offered the possibility of a presidency that extends for more than 6 months and hence the opportunity to impose more coherence on the legislative process. Arguably the European Commission has gained least from the draft convention although the possibility of an elected President may strengthen its legitimacy, although I am not convinced.

The Intergovernmental Conference (IGC) in which the member states will consider the draft and decide whether to change it has begun.
agree a new Constitutional Treaty at a special European Council in March 2004. And there is much to argue over. The nineteen small states do not like the increased powers of the presidency, which they fear will lead to domination by the 6 large states. Poland & Spain dislike the proposed new voting rules which will reduce their influence. Britain is unhappy about proposals for common foreign policy. And so on. Much might change by next March; or it may all turn out to be too difficult and either the draft Constitution will stand; or there will be no new constitution.

Then comes the question of ratification. Some countries will have referendums. The British Government is against one here. I am suspicious of referendums – too easily determined by the mood of the moment and capture by populists. On the other hand, this purports to be a Constitution for Europe. Has the time not come to trust the people and ask their views? But I would suggest a Europe wide referendum on the same day (perhaps with the European Parliament elections next June) and with some form of double majority: two thirds of the votes cast (it is a constitution after all) and two thirds of member states. That way a single country, of any size, cannot stand in the way if others wish to go forward. And it would force politicians to begin to forge a European demos. But then perhaps that is the reason why it won’t happen.

Two other issues over the summer break. First on EMU, is the fiasco that is the Stability and Growth Pact. There is a case for having no SGP at all. A common monetary policy deals with economic shocks that are common across the euro area. Where the shocks are national then national fiscal policy can deal with them. It is possible that irresponsible national authorities could free ride on the system and borrow excessively – hence the no-bail-out clause in the treaty and euro zone surveillance of and some rules on fiscal policy. The current SGP was forged to convince German citizens to give up the DM without fear that Italy would break the bank. The rules were hence tight and inflexible. It is difficult to condemn France and Germany for trying to compensate for over-tight monetary policy by loosening fiscal policy. It is not clear their borrowing is unsustainable yet. It is equally unreasonable to condemn the small member states for protesting at the big members states flouting the rules. The problem is that the credibility of EMU is undermined as the Swedish referendum result demonstrated. There needs to be a reform of the SGP and soon, to a pact that deals in the realities of a functioning eurozone. That requires some serious reformulationation of the long-term objectives of the pact, not budget balance at any cost, and what can be done when growth slows.

Finally the failure of the Cancun WTO ministerial; the key issue was agriculture even though the immediate cause of breakdown was on new WTO rules, these were resisted by developing countries, the African States in particular, but insisted upon by Korea. As a result, agricultural protectionists in India, China and Brazil as much as in Europe the US and East Asia can sigh a sigh of relief. It is hard at this stage to see how the world community can pick this up. No one comes out of the Cancun debacle with any credit. The developing countries have gone away with nothing. The agricultural protectionists have won out.
The EU overplayed its hand on new rules, some think deliberately to block agriculture. The US acted atrociously on the sensitive issue of cotton subsidies, and now threatens to abandon the WTO and do bilateral deals. What to do now? My own preference would be to take new world trade rules off the table and concentrate the agenda on trade liberalisation; this is where development and the WTO intersect. As yet I do not see any emerging consensus on this. Watch this space.

All of the topics discussed above are part of the research agenda of SEI and faculty are actively engaged in these debates. I hope this overview gives new students flavour of the place they have come to.

One final change must also be marked. Viga Nicholson has decided to retire from the University. Her going will leave a huge hole at the heart of SEI. For many people Viga was SEI. She was the engine of the administrative operation right from the first day of the new institute in 1992. She is the last person still working in SEI who was here at he beginning. I and many others will miss daily contact with Viga. She is not however disappearing. She will still organise the Brussels trips for the Diploma and Masters programmes from her eyrie in the hills of Hove and as many already know she will help set up SEI alumni groups. I hope she might reflect on SEI and its first 11 years for the next Euroscoope. I wish her a happy and active retirement.
Summer 2003 saw the launching of the SEI-based European Parties Elections and Referendums Network (EPERN). EPERN is the successor to the Opposing Europe Research Network (OERN). Co-convened by Aleks Szczerbiak and Paul Taggart, OERN was launched in June 2000 as an international network of scholars researching the party politics of Eurosceptic in EU member and candidate states. The network now numbers more than 70 scholars whose research interests cover virtually every EU member, candidate (and non-candidate!) states.

Highlights from the last three years have included: a series of ESRC funded seminars at Cambridge, Warwick, the LSE, Leicester and (of course) Sussex (the key points of which are available as briefing papers) and a workshop at the ECPR 2002 Joint Sessions in Turin. There were also panels at various academic conferences including the PSA, EUSA and APSA. To date the Network has also published 11 working papers jointly with the SEI. The culmination of the first phase of the Network's activities will be the publication in 2004 of a two volume book on 'Opposing Europe: The Party Politics of Euroscepticism' by Oxford University Press. The two volumes will cover country surveys and case studies, and theoretical and comparative perspectives.

It was decided that, after three years of focusing primarily on party-based Euroscepticism, the time had come to broaden out the Network's intellectual focus. Hence the decision to re-launch OERN as EPERN. In fact, in many ways the re-launch simply reflects the fact that the Network has already began to go beyond Euroscepticism to examine the impact of European integration on countries’ domestic politics more generally, particularly as expressed through political parties, elections and referendums. From 2002, the Network has, in conjunction with the Royal Institute for International Affairs, been publishing a series of briefing papers analysing the impact (or non-impact) of the European issue on election campaigns, covering virtually every major election held since then. The Network has also been producing briefing papers on European referendums, starting with the second Irish Nice referendum.

An important element of this broader activity in recent months has focussed on the 2003 EU accession. The Network has produced (or is in the process of producing) briefing papers on all of these held so far (Malta, Slovenia, Hungary, Slovakia, Poland, the Czech Republic - with Lithuania in the pipeline) and will produce one on the Estonian referendum scheduled for September 2004. The authors of these briefings have also been collaborating in a special issue of West European Politics (scheduled for October 2004). Apart from the co-convenors the project participants include: Michelle Cini (Bristol University), Brigid Fowler (University of Birmingham), Sean Hanley (Brunel University), Karen Henderson (Leicester University), Alenka Krasovec (Ljubljana University) and Evald Mikkel (University of Tartu).
The objective is to produce not simply a series of well-researched analytical country case studies but also to make a broader contribution to the (relatively sparse) comparative literature on European referendums. To this end, a seminar involving the project participants was held in the SEI at the end of June, and it is planned to hold a follow-up at the end of October. These seminars are attempting to tease out what (if anything) is different about these referendums and whether it is possible to use them as a basis for developing causal models to predict (European) referendum outcome and turnout.

Meanwhile, the Network has continued to produce working papers and briefing papers. In May, the Network published a working paper on by Professor Clive Church (University of Kent) on ‘The Contexts of Swiss Opposition to Europe.’ Briefing papers were also produced on the Finnish, Estonian, Maltese and Belgian elections.

The next few months will continue to be extremely busy ones for the EPERN. Apart from the OUP book and West European Politics special issue projects, we hope to publish working papers on Euroscepticism in Italian parties, Theorising Party-Based Euroscepticism and the impact of EU enlargement on Central European party systems. We will be producing briefing papers on the Swedish EMU referendum and the Estonian accession referendum. There are also (at the moment tentative) plans to develop a research project linked to the June 2004 European Parliament elections. Watch this space.

All our publications and latest news of our activities is available from the EPERN website. For further information or to keep up with the latest developments, contact the convenors (a.a.szczerbiak@sussex.ac.uk or p.a.taggart@sussex.ac.uk) or visit the EPERN homepage at: http://www.sussex.ac.uk/Units/SEI/areas/OpposingEurope.html

In Brief
Aleks Szczerbiak

May 9th - made a presentation on "Poland" and participated in a round table seminar on "Enlarging Europe: Hungary, Poland and the Czech Republic Preparing to Join" organised by the Royal Institute for International Affairs European Programme
June 13th - organised and participated in a seminar on the "2003 EU Accession Referendums" for contributors to a special issue of West European Politics, SEI
June 20th - chaired and participated in a seminar on "The Centre-Right in Post-Communist East and Central Europe", SSEES/UCL, London (see separate report)
September 11th-12th - made a presentation on "Communist Successor Parties Survival Strategies," and participated in a panel on "The Left in Transition," at a conference on "Mapping the Left in an Enlarged European Union: Convergence or Divergence?" Institute for German Studies, University of Birmingham
September 19th-21th - gave a paper "Solidarity Electoral Action: The Polish Centre-Right's Last Best Hope?" in a panel on "Centre-Right Parties in Central Europe" at European Consortium for Political Research General Conference, Marburg, Germany
Dear Friends

Hello again from sunny Brighton! Hope that you still remember Brighton and Sussex....

The reason that I am writing is to let you know that: I am coordinating the "Friends of the SEI Society". I will also continue to be involved in organizing study trips to Brussels. The objective of the "Friends of SEI" society is to create network of alumni and to arrange Local reunions and meetings as well as bigger events, create a website, raise funds etc.

We already have following enthusiastic co-ordinators:

MALTA   Nicole Lungaro-Mifsud, nicolelm@hotmail.com
BRUSSELS  Aurelie Godefroy - aurelie.godefroy@euralia.com
BULGARIA  Lyubomira Neshева - l_neshева@dir.bg
LATVIA  Solvita Strausa - SolvitaS@eib.lv
CZECH REPUBLIC  Ivana - Sverakova iwik@email.cz
SLOVENIA  Andrej Vrcon - Andrej.Vrcon@gov.si
POLAND  Kasia Trusiewicz - katarzynatrusiewicz@wp.pl
        Monika Pietraszek - mopi01@handelsbanken.se
GERMANY  Florian Lottmann flottmann@n-tv.de

At this stage we would like you to contact either me or your local co-ordinator so that we can register your interest. Next stage is to get this going so we need a lot of enthusiasm which I am sure you have!

Once we hear from you with your comments and suggestions we will be contacting everyone again before the website is created and then it is up to you to make it happen! Perhaps starting off with local reunions? We would also like someone to write something for the Euroscope and the website. Any volunteers please?

Lastly I would like to say what a great pleasure it has been for me during the 11 years at SEI to meet so many wonderful people – so many of whom have become friends. Thank you very much for making my job so interesting and special!

My new email address is "viga@onetel.com"

With my best wishes to you all

Viga
GETTING THE CENTRE-RIGHT RIGHT

Aleks Szczerbiak

At the end of June, the SEI’s Dr Aleks Szczerbiak and Dr Sean Hanley (University of Brunel - from September SSEES/UCL) organised an informal seminar on the right-wing and centre-right parties in post-communist East and Central Europe at the University of London's School of Slavonic and East European Studies. Given the significance of these parties, the post-communist centre-right remains a woefully under-researched topic compared with the voluminous literature on communist successor parties or even the relatively extensively studied extreme right. The seminar, which was funded by the Political Studies Association, was an informal ‘seed corn’ event to develop comparative and collaborative research on this topic.

The discussion was chaired by Aleks Szczerbiak and based on a framework paper written by Sean Hanley. Other participants included Brigid Fowler (University of Birmingham), Dr Tim Haughton (SSEES/UCL - from September Birmingham), Dr Petr Kopecky (University of Leiden) and Dr Paul Lewis (Open University). Between them the participants’ expertise covered the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and Slovakia, with Professor Paul Webb from Sussex IR and Politics also present to give a comparative West European perspective. Discussion focused on two particular sets of issues. In the morning the nature of the right and centre-right was discussed particularly the difficulties of defining these terms. In the afternoon, discussion turned to identifying the factors that could account for the varying levels of success of centre-right parties across the region. A briefing note setting out the main points is available from Aleks Szczerbiak (a.a.szczerbiak@sussex.ac.uk).

The seminar is one of a series of events aimed at developing research on this topic. Three of the seminar participants - Brigid Fowler, Sean Hanley and Aleks Szczerbiak - will be presenting country case study papers on Hungary, the Czech Republic and Poland to a panel at the ECPR General Conference at Marburg in September chaired by Paul Lewis. The papers will focus on the theme of the varying strength and cohesiveness of centre-right parties in the region and it is hoped that they can be published, together with a Slovak case study paper, as a journal special issue. More broadly, there are plans to hold seminars and conferences and publish research papers that can integrate the study of the post-communist centre-right into that of West European centre-right, where research is equally undeveloped. This will begin with publication of Sean Hanley's framework paper in the Sussex working paper series. It is also hoped to involve other Sussex researchers, particularly those with West European expertise, in this venture.

Recent Publications – Aleks Szczerbiak

Wrote the “Political Developments” section for the June and September 2003 Economist Intelligence Unit Country Report and 2003 Country Forecast on Poland.

"Domestic Political Drama" (2002 Poland Country Report), Transitions On Line, April 2003


"The Polish EU Accession Referendum, 7-8 June 2003," Opposing Europe Research Network Referendum Briefing No 5, June 2003


"Poland in the EU: It's Not Over Yet," Transitions On Line, August 2003


"Polish Euroscepticism in the Run Up to EU Accession," European Studies, forthcoming, 2003
