Message from the Co-Director

A Happy New Year to all SEI staff, students and friends both at Sussex and beyond! European developments during the first half of 2007 are likely to be dominated by the German Presidency of the EU, to which SEI faculty Lucia Quaglia and Dan Hough devote our main feature in this issue of ‘Euroscope’. As they point out, although the German government takes over Presidency at a difficult time for the EU, it has an ambitious prospectus that includes: re-launching the constitutional treaty, commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of the signing of the Treaties of Rome in March, and developing EU policies on economic reform, energy, and foreign policy and security. As well as providing analysis of EU developments on an ongoing basis through our publications and seminars, SEI is also hoping to organise a special event to evaluate how successful the German government has been in making progress in all of these areas.

A broad and inclusive approach to Europe

One area where the German government appears less keen to move forward is the EU enlargement process, except in the case of Croatia. Nonetheless, the beginning of 2007 also saw the accession to the EU of Bulgaria and Romania, joining the eight post-communist states that became members in 2004. EU enlargement has always been a special area of concern for SEI, given the broad and inclusive approach to studying contemporary Europe that we have pioneered over the years, and one in which we have much expertise. This term, SEI will be examining the impact of EU enlargement on domestic politics in Bulgaria and Romania countries at a special ‘roundtable’ in February.

As part of this commitment to breadth and inclusivity in contemporary European studies, and particularly engagement with the former communist states of Central and Eastern Europe, SEI is also continuing its very successful ‘Wider Europe’ project. In this issue of ‘Euroscope’ you can read about the recent activities and future plans of this Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO) and European Commission (EC) funded project, including its annual conference, held in Kiev last October.

Welcome to Chevening Fellows

As the spring term begins, I would like to extend a special welcome to the new cohort of students joining SEI for a 12-week intensive programme under the Chevening Fellowship scheme on European Political Economy. The Fellowship programme is a new development aimed at mid-career professionals from the post-2004 members of the EU, EU candidate states and some of the EU neighbourhood countries. After running a successful initial programme in January-April 2006, the FCO has extended it to the years 2007-9. Of this year’s cohort of 13 fellows, three come from Hungary, two from Bulgaria, and one each from Armenia, Croatia, and so on.
the Czech Republic, Estonia, Latvia, Poland, Slovenia and Turkey. I am sure we will all learn a lot from the presence of a group of very impressive and committed professionals. I would also like to welcome back my Co-Director, Professor Jim Rollo, who returns after a term’s research leave and who will be directing the academic courses and visits for this extremely successful programme.

Hosting the Chevening Fellowship programme reflects the SEI’s expertise in providing postgraduate training for practitioners whose work brings them into regular contact with the European integration process. More broadly, it stems from our belief in making our research policy relevant and accessible to a wide range of non-academic audiences, exemplified by our vibrant network of Practitioner Fellows. In ‘SEI Dispatches’ you will find an article from one of these Practitioner Fellows, Dr Indira Konjhodzic, an SEI alumnus who has gone on to become a World Bank Director, firstly in Croatia and more recently at its Washington headquarters.

Professional development for doctoral students

Our Chevening Fellows join our existing cohort of 35 Masters students who commenced their studies in October, and 30 doctoral students; 7 of whom started this year. In this issue of ‘Euroscope’ you can read a report from one of our new doctoral students, John Fitzgibbon, on his experiences, particularly on the series of professional development workshops that SEI has been running during the autumn term. These workshops reflect the strong emphasis that SEI places on helping our research students to begin career planning as soon as they commence their studies. You can also find out about the SEI doctoral scholarship opportunities available for students hoping to start in autumn 2007. More details of these are available on the back pages.

Prolific research output

During the last few months, SEI-affiliated scholars have continued to be prolific in their research output and November alone saw the publication of no fewer than four SEI working papers. These cover a range of different SEI research projects including: the influence of the shared Polish-Ukrainian past on contemporary politics in these states; the roles and background of new members of the European Parliament; the impact of private financial interests on European financial market integration, and the 2005 Bulgarian parliamentary election. The SEI-based international European Parties Elections and Referendums Network (EPERN) continues with its influential and highly successful briefing papers on the impact of European issues on recent elections with papers on the Czech Republic, Hungary, Cyprus and Sweden.

SEI also continues its lively research in progress seminars. Speakers in the spring term will include: Dr Kalypso Nicolaïdis (Oxford), Dr David Howarth (Edinburgh) and Professor Christopher Hill (Cambridge), together with our own faculty presenting their ongoing research. I am particularly pleased that one of the latter will be Susan Mills, who joined the University of Sussex last September as Professor of Law.

Welcome back Helen!

However, the highlight of our spring term seminar series will undoubtedly be a visit from my illustrious predecessor, Professor Helen Wallace. Helen played a pivotal role in re-establishing SEI in 1992 and, as its founding Director until 2001, building it up into one of the foremost centres of cutting edge academic research and leading postgraduate training centre on contemporary European studies. I also – along with very many others, both here at the SEI and beyond – owe Helen an enormous debt of gratitude for the role that she played in my professional development. So we were all absolutely delighted when Helen received a highly prestigious Award for ‘Lifetime Achievement in Contemporary European Studies’ at the Universities Association for Contemporary European Studies (UACES) Annual Conference last September reflecting her very distinguished career. Many congratulations from all of us, Helen!

Thanks

Finally, once again a special word of thanks to ‘Euroscope’”s dynamic editor SEI doctoral student Dan Keith for putting together another excellent issue. I marvel at how he finds time to do this and still do his doctoral research (but he does, and the latter is most impressive!) Well done Dan!

Prof Aleks Szczerbiak
SEI Diary

During autumn 2006 members of SEI have been involved in many memorable activities connected to teaching and research on contemporary Europe.

September: Papers

William Outhwaite took part in a public lecture series in summer 2006 at Oldenburg, Germany, on capitalism and democracy. He also addressed the Nordic Sociological Association's annual conference in August at Turku, Finland on 'The Future of Society'.

Peter Holmes, Jim Rollo David Evans and other colleagues completed in 2006 a major project for DFID on the evaluation of Regional Trade Agreements (RTAs). A three day conference was held at Sussex Sept 28th-30th, with speakers from DG Trade, WTO, and UNCTAD as well as SEI. This led to further work, including a project for the EU on a possible EU-India FTA, in partnership with CUTS (Jaipur, India), for which a presentation was given by Mike Gasiorek, Peter Holmes & Jim Rollo at DG Trade on Oct 16th in Brussels.

Peter Holmes & Anna Sydorak presented two joint papers during September: "Rivalry and cooperation in European competition policy: towards a global competition cartel?" at the European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR) Third Pan-European Conference 21-23 September, Bilgi University, Istanbul, and, "Competition policy in the EU accession process: Lessons for the European Neighbourhood Policy" at the European Association for Comparative Economics Studies (EACES) 9th Bi-Annual Conference, Sept 7-9th 2006.

During September Peter Holmes also published the article "Trade and 'domestic' policies: the European Mix' in the Journal of European Public Policy (No. 6, September 2006).

At the end of September, Lucia Quaglia took part in a workshop organised by Claudio Radaelli at the University of Exeter to discuss the activities of the team studying 'experts' (ie technocratic elites) in the EU, as part of FP6 INTUNE project (see section on research projects). The specific objective of the workshop at Exeter was to finalise the questionnaire design for technocratic elites, to discuss the modalities of the fieldwork planned between January and April 2007 and to report on the research activities conducted so far.

October: New Arrivals

At the beginning of the academic year, SEI welcomed 25 new students on the MA in Contemporary European Studies (European Public Policy) programme, 6 new students on the M.A. in European Politics programme and 5 Visiting ERASMUS students. SEI also had an intake of 7 new Research students beginning in October (See below).

SEI also began a series of Research Student Workshops in October. The workshops are an informal op-

SEI Research Student Intake (2006-7)

- DPhil: Monika Bil working on Political Parties and the state in Poland with Dan Hough and Aleks Szczepanik (Recipient of PoCIES GTA Scholarship)
- DPhil: Ina Grebliaitaite working on EU Democratic Deficit with Paul Taggart and Lucia Quaglia, (Recipient of Cockfield scholarship)
- DPhil: Martine Huberty working on EU and Luxembourg with Paul Taggart and Tim Bale
- DPhil: Ruth Johnson working on Italy and the EU with Francis McGowan and Lucia Quaglia
- DPhil (distant): Anya Dahmani is registered as a distant student working on JHA with Jörg Monar in Strasbourg and Marie-Benedicte Dembour at Sussex
- MSc + DPhil: John Fitzgibbon working on Eurosceptic Protest Movements in Ireland with Aleks Szczepanik and Paul Taggart (taking the MSc in first year as part of 1+3 programme)
- MPhil: Fuat Canan working on EU security issues and Turkey with Adrian Treacher
opportunity for SEI research students to meet with faculty and researchers to discuss their research and professional development. Workshops held this term included:

- ‘The Research Student Start Up Kit’ run by Paul Taggart and Aleks Szczepański.
- ‘Designing Dissertations as Books’ by Dan Hough and James Hampshire.

The series of workshops continues in the Spring Term. See page 19 for more information and John Fitzgibbon's review of the workshops.

During October, Mark Bennett delivered a seminar at the Menzies Centre, Kings College, London in October comparing John Howard and Tony Blair as prime ministers. The seminar, part of the Menzies Centre's series of seminars on Australian Studies attracted a large group of academics, and others with a keen interest in Australian issues.

During the term, John Fitzgibbon was elected as a member of the Committee of the UACES Student Forum. Many congratulations to John who joins forces with SEI research student Katerina Tsoukala, who is continuing her term in office as JCER Officer.

Congratulations also go to Katerina Tsoukala who has been awarded a highly competitive Visiting Fellowship for 2007 by the EU Institute for Security Studies in Paris. The Fellowship, which runs for 3 months from January until March, was awarded for Katerina's research proposal on European Defence Procurement and the role of Small and Medium Defence Enterprises in Western and Eastern Europe.

SEI DPhil student Simona Guerra presented a paper, 'Converging Poles: Polish Public Opinion Path Towards Accession' at the International Conference in Memory of Professor Gorge Blazyca at the University of Paisley, 10-11 November. The Centre for Contemporary European Studies and Paisley Business School organized the conference aiming to take forward Professor Blazyca's work.

A distinguished academic, George Blazyca graduated from the University of

### New Working Papers

During November there were four new additions to the SEI Working Papers series. These are:

- Nat Copsey’s *Echoes of the Past in Contemporary Politics: the case of Polish-Ukrainian Relations.*
- Lyubka Savkova’s *Spoilt for Choice, Yet Hard to Get: Voters and Parties at the Bulgarian 2005 Parliamentary Election.*
- Lucia Quaglia’s *Setting the pace? Private financial interests and European financial market integration.*
- Paul Taggart and Tim Bale’s *First-Timers Yes, Virgins No: The Roles and Backgrounds of New Members of the European Parliament.*

Abstracts for all four new Working Papers are included in this issue of ‘Euroscope’ on page 7.
Sussex, where he completed an MA and DPhil on the Polish economy, and dedicated his work on a wider background of Polish history. The conference gathered academics from Poland and UK.

In mid November, Lucia Quaglia presented her forthcoming book on *Central Banking Governance in the European Union: A Comparative Analysis of the Bank of England, the Bundesbank, the Bank of Italy and the European Central Bank* (Routledge) at a research seminar at the University of Kent.

Mark Bennister conducted his ESRC funded fieldwork during November and December. He has conducted interviews with a range of politicians, senior public servants, and commentators. He has been based in the Political Science Program of the Research School of Social Sciences at ANU and has also visited Monash University in Melbourne and Griffith University in Brisbane. Building links with senior academics along the way. He attended the Australia and New Zealand School of Government (ANZSOG) GovNet Conference in November.

In response to a request for somewhere informal to meet and have coffee/lunches SEI has opened access to its library room giving research students access to kettle, fridge, microwave and some comfortable chairs. This provides staff and research students somewhere to meet with each other to have coffees/lunches and as an alternative place to meet with students.

**Teaching Best Practice Workshop**

SEI and PoICES ran a Best Practice Teaching Workshop on 29 November following a request from research students for a forum to discuss teaching. The workshop featured 3 short presentations:

- ‘Ten Ten Top Tips’ for Lectures by Tim Bale
- ‘Structuring Seminars’ by Dan Hough
- ‘Lessons from the Chalkface (or ‘Trained Teacher Teaches Tutors About Teaching Techniques’)’ by Sally Marthaler

**EPERN Briefing Papers**

This autumn there were four new election briefings by the European Parties Elections and Referendums Network (EPERN).

- *Europe and the Czech Parliamentary Elections of 2-3 June 2006*, by Dr Seán Hanley (SEI Visiting Academic Fellow)
- *Europe and the Hungarian Elections of April 2006*, by Prof Nick Sitter and Dr Agnes Batory
- *The Swedish Parliamentary Election of September 2005*, by Niklas Bolin and Nicholas Aylott

The Key points summarising all four new EPERN election briefings can be found on page 9.

In late November Jim Rollo presented the paper ‘Analysis on WTO negotiation and Free Trade Agreement’ to the ‘Opening, Development and Participation – China’s Five Year accession to WTO’ conference held by the Department of Foreign Trade and Economic Cooperation of Guangdong Province (DOFTEC).

**December: UACES Scholarship**

Congratulations to SEI research student Simona Guerra who has been awarded a highly competitive UACES Scholarship for 2007. The scholarship will provide funding for Simona to conduct focus group research on the impact of EU accession and information on Polish attitudes towards European integration in two Polish regions. Simona returns to SEI in January 2007 after spending 4 months as a visiting researcher at the European University Institute in Florence.

Simona's success follows a successful UACES Scholarship application in 2005 by fellow SEI research student Nat Copsey, for conducting focus groups and elite interviews exploring the relationship between foreign policy and public opinion in the Polish-Ukrainian Borderlands.

On 14 December Simona presented a paper to the Research on Democracies
Workshop at the European University Institute titled ‘The Hour of Europe has Come: Polish Support for the EU’. The workshop had a practical theme and provided an opportunity to discuss the methods Simona is using in her research.

In early December, Lucia Quaglia took part and acted as a discussant at the Round Table on Monetary Policy and Inflation Targeting organised by the central bank of Albania. The roundtable brought together practitioners and academics with a view to discuss the reform of the institutional configuration and policy framework of the central bank.

During December SEI Faculty and students participated in a football match. This involved Head of Department of Politics and Contemporary European Studies (in which SEI is located), Professor Paul Webb (pictured below), providing some important advice to tutors for teaching - Always stay one step in front the students and always keep your eye on the ball.

The end of the autumn term saw MACES, MAEP and research students continue the SEI tradition of bringing in foods, reflecting their home countries’ cuisine, to the SEI Christmas party.

On 18 December SEI Co-Director Jim Rollo presented on the Post-Doha Agenda, Trade and Multilateralism to the International Economics Programme at Chatham House.

**Upcoming**

"SEI in a network of Excellence": SEI was a founding partner, in 2005, of the EU-funded EU-CONSENT network of excellence. These networks promote joint research and education activities among their participating partners centred on particular themes. The focus of EU-CONSENT is ‘Wider Europe, Deeper Integration?’ and this is split into various working groups. SEI is part of the External Relations working group (looking at the impact of the recent and future enlargements on EU external relations).

In addition to its plenary and working group conferences and workshops, EU-CONSENT also comprises the creation of teaching packages and it has a strong emphasis on the advancement of the participating partners’ doctoral students. To this end, it is running a series of PHD Schools. SEI’s Katerina Tsoukala has already attended one in Lisbon, while Rose Azzopardi and Rasa Spokeviciute are about to attend another in Dublin. You can find out more about EU-CONSENT at [www.eu-consent.net](http://www.eu-consent.net). SEI’s contact person is Adrian Treacher.

**Submissions to Euroscope**

Euroscope welcomes submissions for its Summer issue. Please send information for the SEI Diary, or short articles on ongoing research projects, reviews of events by the deadline of 30 March. e-mail submissions to Euroscope: euroscope@sussex.ac.uk

Or contact Euroscope Editor Dan Keith: D.J.Keith@sussex.ac.uk

Thanks to Alex Stephenson for providing the photo of Paul Webb (left). More photos of the match are available at

SEI Working Papers present research results, accounts of work-in-progress and background information for those concerned with contemporary European issues. There are four new additions to the SEI Working Papers Series. The abstracts of the papers are presented below.

• SEI Working Paper No.87
  
  Echoes of the Past in Contemporary Politics: the case of Polish-Ukrainian Relations

  Nathaniel Copsey
  Sussex European Institute
  N.W.Copsey@sussex.ac.uk

  Abstract

  This paper examines the influence of the shared Polish-Ukrainian past on contemporary politics in both countries, with the emphasis on Poland. It argues that despite sporadic appearances to the contrary, the past is much less important to most political parties than might be assumed.

  The spotlight is on Poland since media coverage in Poland seems to indicate a higher level of past influence on contemporary politics than is actually the case. Its structure is as follows. Section one very briefly reviews what historical events continue to cause controversy in the Polish-Ukrainian past. It then looks at the evidence of commemorative ceremonies and investigates why these have the capacity to upset relations between the two countries. Section two examines what precise impact the past has on Polish politicians and political parties, and discusses how and why the situation differs in Ukraine.

• SEI Working Paper No.88

  Spoilt for Choice, Yet Hard to Get: Voters and Parties at the Bulgarian 2005 Parliamentary Election

  Lyubka Savkova
  Sussex European Institute
  L.Savkova@sussex.ac.uk

  Abstract

  The June 2005 parliamentary election in Bulgaria produced the most fragmented and variegated political configuration since the beginning of the transition period, as seven parties and coalitions managed to carve out parliamentary presence in the 40th National Assembly. The election result may lead to a restructuring of the Bulgarian political system and has once again called into question its stability at a critical time when the country was preparing for EU membership.

  The Bulgarian Socialist Party as part of Coalition for Bulgaria was returned to office after eight years in opposition but its lacklustre performance at the polls left it looking for coalition partners from the centre of the party system. The parties on the right were soundly defeated while the centrist formation of the Bulgarian ex-king, National Movement Simeon II, came a respectable second. One surprise from the election was the breakthrough of the first anti-establishment formation in Bulgaria, Coalition Union Attack, which leapfrogged to fourth place in the running parliament. A second surprise was the doubling of the votes for the Turkish minority party in Bulgaria, Movement for Rights and Freedoms, which achieved its best election result since the party was formed.

All Working Papers are downloadable free of charge from the web: 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')
First-Timers Yes, Virgins No: The Roles and Backgrounds of New Members of the European Parliament

Tim Bale and Paul Taggart
Sussex European Institute
T.P.Bale@sussex.ac.uk
P.A.Taggart@sussex.ac.uk

Abstract

This paper reports on a project designed to add to our understanding of the European Parliament by exploring and explaining the roles taken on by its newest members. It outlines an the rationale for, and an initial attempt to construct, a typology of role orientations (or cognitions) from interviews with over fifty ‘first-time’ MEPs, twenty from the ten ‘accession states’ and thirty from the ‘EU-15’ (see Bale and Taggart, 2005). Its other purpose, is to provide an overall picture of the previous experience and demographic profiles of the 2004 cohort of first-time MEPs – data that we hope will be of general interest (partly because we compare first-timers from the accession and EU-15 states) and will in time be used to determine the relative impact of social background and institutional socialisation in the roles adopted by Europe’s new parliamentarians.

The research for this paper was funded by the Nuffield Foundation under ‘The New European Parliament and the New European Parliamentarians’.

Setting the pace? Private financial interests and European financial market integration

Lucia Quaglia
Sussex European Institute
L.Quaglia@sussex.ac.uk

Abstract

The regulation and supervision of financial services in the EU has undergone significant change between 2000 and 2005, when the so-called Lamfalussy framework, the Basel 2 agreement and its transposition into the Capital Requirement Directive were agreed. This research examines the preferences of national financial interest groups, the independent variable, in shaping national input and more precisely, the contributions given by the relevant public authorities, into EU and international policy-making processes (the dependent variable). The impact, if any, on the final outputs (the relevant international and EU agreements) is also discussed.

The empirical research presented in this paper focuses on the UK and Germany, which, besides being two of the largest countries in the EU, have been crucial players in the reforms under consideration. The interest groups studied are those in the banking sector, and it is important to distinguish between the level of involvement each interest group has and their degree of influence in policy making processes. The former depends on the policy content, namely, whether the policy concerns a broad institutional issue or specific rules, whilst the latter depends on domestic institutions, namely state structure, interest representation and political economy institutions.
European Parties Elections & Referendums Network (EPERN): Election Briefing Papers

The network produces an ongoing series of briefings on the impact of European integration on election campaigns. There are four new additions to the election briefing paper series. Key points from the papers are outlined below. All EPERN briefing papers are available free at

www.sussex.ac.uk/sei/1-4-2-8.html

- **ELECTION BRIEFING No 27**
  EUROPE AND THE CZECH PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS OF 2-3 JUNE 2006

  Dr Seán Hanley  
  School of Slavonic and East European Studies, UCL  
  Email: s.hanley@ssees.ac.uk

**Key points:**

- Since the 2002 election all five parliamentary parties had replaced their leaders, some more than once, and a new President had taken office.
- Issues of tax reform and corruption dominated an acrimonious campaign. Unlike in the previous 2002 election, European issues played little role.
- The opposition centre-right Civic Democrats won the election with dramatically increased support.

If you would like to be included in our mailing list for seminars, please contact Christine Kidman or Amanda Sims, tel: 01273 678578, email: sei@sussex.ac.uk
• The incumbent Social Democrats also polled strongly and gained support.
• Smaller parties such the Communists and Christian Democrats lost ground.
• The Czech Greens entered parliament independently for the first time. After the election they allied themselves with the centre-right.
• After the election, left and right were exactly balanced in parliament with no viable majority coalition other than a Grand Coalition.
• Successive negotiations to agree a minority government ‘tolerated’ by other parties have failed.
• The Civic Democrats downplayed their party’s Euroscepticism. Whatever government finally takes office, Czech European policy is unlikely to change radically.

• ELECTION BRIEFING No 28
EUROPE AND THE HUNGARIAN ELECTIONS OF APRIL 2006

Prof Nick Sitter
Norwegian School of Management (BI)
Email: Nick.sitter@bi.no

Dr Agnes Batory
Central European University
Email: Batorya@ceu.hu

Key points:
• The elections returned the centre-left Socialist-Free Democrat coalition to office.
• The re-election for the first time in Hungary’s post-communist history of a government signals further party system consolidation.
• The campaigns focused on economic issues, with the almost complete absence of European integration from the party debate.
• The smaller parties did unexpectedly well, with both passing the electoral threshold contrary to expectations.
• Lack of cooperation within the centre-right camp had a major impact on the outcome.
• Turnout was relatively high at nearly 68% in the first round and 63% in the second.
• The government followed up the election with an expected (though not promised) fiscal tightening, and was predictably punished for this in the October local elections.

• ELECTION BRIEFING No.29
THE PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS OF MAY 2006 IN THE REPUBLIC OF CYPRUS

George Charalambous
Department of Politics
University of Manchester
Email: georgecharalam-bous@hotmail.com

Key Points:
• This was the first time Greek Cypriots cast their votes since the April 2004 referendum on the ill-fated Anan Plan and references to a new just and viable solution to the Cyprus problem constituted one of the main focal points of party campaigns.
• Between the presidential elections of 2003 and the 2006 parliamentary elections polls showed an increasing popularity of the coalition leaders of the Communists and the Democratic Party and a high percentage of the electorate trusting the president Tassos Papadopoulos.
• A split occurred within the right-wing opposition party, Democratic Rally and the splinter group that left joined with the extreme right-wing New Horizons and formed the European Party.
• The two main parties, the Communists and right-wing Democratic Rally both lost support but remained first and second respectively keeping
their core constituencies intact.

- The parties at the centre of the party system the Democratic Party and the Social Democrats achieved an increase of support and reached their highest percentage after years of stagnation.
- The European issue was mentioned constantly as a solution to many problems, including reunification and parties were once again divided on a left-right dimension with the communists being the only party arguing against recent treaties and directives.

**ELECTION BRIEFING No.30**

**THE SWEDISH PARLIAMENTARY ELECTION OF SEPTEMBER 2006**

Niklas Bolin  
Department of Political Science, Umeå University, Sweden  
niklas.bolin@pol.umu.se

Nicholas Aylott  
School of Social Sciences, Södertörn University College, Sweden  
nicholas.aylott@sh.se

**Key Points:**

- Despite strong economic growth, the Social Democrats suffered their worst election result since the 1920s and lost power. The long-serving prime minister and party leader, Göran Persson, immediately accepted the consequences of the result and announced his resignation from both posts.
- The centre-right parties had formed a pre-electoral coalition, the ‘Alliance for Sweden’, in 2004. This constituted the most extensive collaboration ever for the non-socialist parties.
- The Moderates, led by the new prime minister, Fredrik Reinfeldt, achieved their best electoral result since the 1920s and the biggest jump in support for any party in Swedish history.
- Issues over Europe and EU were virtually absent from the election campaign.
Germany will be taking over the rotating presidency of the European Union in January 2007. It will be doing so at a difficult time. Expectations, as is the case with every EU presidency, are high. Although a detailed programme of the German presidency’s aims will only be presented shortly before it actually begins, the Chancellor Angela Merkel, as well as other high-ranking officials, are slowly starting to reveal what policy areas the German presidency is likely to prioritise. The main emphasis will be to re-launch (if largely behind the scenes) the Constitutional Treaty, to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the signing of the Treaties of Rome on 25th March, place an increased emphasis on the issues of economic reform, to develop a coherent EU energy policy, work on the development of CFSP, and, finally, to bring the European Union closer to its citizens.

On a more symbolic level, the 50th anniversary of the signing of the Treaties of Rome will take place on the 25th March and the German presidency has scheduled a special session of the European Council in Berlin to mark the occasion. At the end of this session EU heads of state and government, as well as the presidents of the European Parliament and of the European Commission, are likely to issue a joint statement, the ‘Berlin Declaration’, designed to strengthen the EU’s values and to provide a road map for its future development.

In terms of strategy, the German presidency is likely to be divided into two phases.

In the fields of economic and social policy there is a vague commitment to encourage greater economic dynamism across Europe’s sluggish economies as well as (an even more) vague willingness to shape reform in a socially responsible fashion. These are coupled with a set of specific proposals concerning energy policy that were prompted by the 2006 Ukrainian gas crisis. In terms of CFSP, increasing security and stability in the Western Balkans (especially Kosovo) will be a major element of the German presidency, and it is likely to develop relations with Russia.

The German government (and subsequently the German presidency) seems less keen to proceed with the enlargement process. Apart from the case of Croatia, Angela Merkel’s government is much more reticent in supporting further enlargements than was Gerhard Schröder’s. Merkel’s CDU/CSU continues to campaign vigorously, for example, for a ‘privileged partnership’ between the EU and Turkey (i.e. with Turkey not obtaining full EU membership).

In terms of strategy, the German presidency is likely to be divided into two phases. The key event that will divide the two will un-
doubtedly be the (landmark) French presidential election in May 2007 as well as, to a much lesser extent, the 50th anniversary celebrations of the EU. The first phase will mostly be devoted to ‘normal’ EU activity while the second half – culminating in the June European Council – will concentrate on developing a road map on how to address the constitutional impasse, outlining the new mission of the EU and re-launching the Constitutional Treaty (or some other form of constitutional documentation to replace it).

For Merkel, Germany’s EU presidency is of genuine personal significance. She began her tenure as chancellor by claiming that the coalition would make “many small steps forward” as it reformed Germany’s ailing economy and creaking institutional framework. Although Merkel herself enjoyed high popularity ratings until early 2006, they soon started falling as did the electorate’s opinion of her party – as the ‘small steps’ failed to really lead anywhere. Merkel therefore needs Germany’s tenure as European president to be successful more than most.

Divisions between the coalition partners and within the CDU/CSU have prompted Merkel to articulate Germany’s EU agenda thus far with some caution. The German presidency is therefore likely to expend most of its energy on ‘small steps’ of reform at the EU level much as it is attempting to do at home. Merkel and her foreign minister Steinmeier (SPD) will try to install more confidence in the both the EU’s mission and also in its processes; vital not just abroad, but also, even in Euro-enthusiastic Germany, at home. One thing that Germany will not be able to do is articulate ideas that involve increasing EU spending. Few, if any, states support any such financial expansion, least of all Germany which currently finds itself faced with a budget deficit, low growth and high unemployment (particularly in the East).

The German presidency is therefore unlikely to ‘reinvent the EU’, despite this being the presidency’s likely slogan. The low rates of trust that citizens across Europe have in the EU offer, on the one hand, a thoughtful German presidency the opportunity to illustrate why the EU exists, how it contributes to improving citizens’ lives and making significant steps towards addressing the considerable challenges that the EU now faces. If

‘It is unlikely that internal German politics will play much of a role in shaping the German presidency.’

Merkel’s government is unable to concretise its noble ideas into tangible outputs, if disagreements on the future of Constitutional Treaty prove as intractable as they have been in the recent past and if the 50th anniversary celebrations look like elites patting each other on the back, then the Germany presidency will achieve little. Enlargement of the Union is also unlikely to figure highly, given that it is the one issue which is of genuine incendiary character within Germany (divisions being evident at both the elite and popular levels). The fact that Germany’s closest and most loyal ally, France, is unlikely to be able to offer much in the way of active support (particularly in terms of resurrecting the Constitutional Treaty) will not be of any comfort to German policy-makers. Germany’s increasingly difficult relationship with Poland will also worry many, ensuring that Merkel will have to work particularly hard to achieve consensus on many more issues than would normally be the case.

It is unlikely that internal German politics will play much of a role in shaping the German presidency. The traditional German pro-European consensus remains and is likely to be unchallenged. It is also worth remembering that each presidency’s programme represents more of a wish list than a record of doable things – and the German presidency is likely to be no exception.

Conferences and Seminars

SEI members present a series of reports outlining several of the seminars and conferences that SEI has organised or been involved with. Nat Copsey reports on the activities of the Wider Europe Network; Lyubka Savkova reviews the Fourth International Workshop on Strategic Elites and EU Enlargement and Anya Dahmani reflects on the European Studies Research Students’ Conference.

Wider Europe Conference Report 2006

Nat Copsey

Sussex European Institute’s 2006 Wider Europe Conference, organised jointly by Professor Alan Mayhew, Jean Monnet Chair of European Studies, and Nat Copsey, over 5-7 October 2006, was the third in a series of annual events that bring together academics, diplomats, civil servants, and other stakeholders to discuss the European Union’s New Neighbourhood Policy (ENP).

This third conference was co-organised with the British Council and the European Integration Committee of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, and generously co-sponsored by the Foreign and Commonwealth Office and the European Commission. This year we once again concentrated on relations with Ukraine, as the most promising state currently targeted by European Neighbourhood Policy.

Speakers at the Conference included: Markus Lyra, Finnish Under-Secretary of State for Political Affairs in Ministry of Foreign Affairs; Olga Shumylo, International Centre for Prospective Research; Sarah Whitmore, Oxford Brookes University; Nat Copsey, Sussex European Institute; Timothy Barrow, British Ambassador; Ihor Dir, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Kyiv; Vadym Triukhan, Ministry of Foreign Affairs; Roman Petrov, European University Institute; Lena Zerkal, Ministry of Justice; Miriam Brewka, European Commission; Rainer Lindner, Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik, Berlin; Valeriy Pyatnitskiy, Deputy Minister for the Economy, Kyiv; Martin Raiser, World Bank Lead Ukrainian Economist; Danuta Hübner, European Commissioner; Christophe Hillion, University of Leiden; Pawel Swieboda, Director of DemosEUROPA; Jörg Monar, Sussex European Institute; Jim Rollo, Sussex European Institute; and Hryhoriy Nemyria, foreign affairs advisor to Yulia Tymoshenko.

Speaking on behalf of the Presidency of the European Union, Markus Lyra appraised the progress made by Ukraine and the Union in fulfilling their current Partnership and Cooperation Agreement and Action Plan, as well as sketching out a perspective for the future that - in the opinion of the Finnish government at least - does not exclude membership. Ukraine is on track to join the World Trade Organisation within the next few months - provided the remaining necessary legislation passes through the Verkhovna Rada - an essential step if Ukraine is to agree a free trade area with the Union. Subsequently, the Conference was structured around the next generation of EU-Ukraine agreements, looking at what it would be desirable to include in a new agreement. This was particularly important in the run-up to the next EU-Ukraine summit, to be held at the end of October 2006 in Helsinki.

The Conference also debated legal aspects of European Neighbourhood Policy, the economic and political developments within Ukraine since the parliamentary elections of 2006 and Russian policy on Ukraine.

Next year, the Wider Europe Programme will continue to monitor the European Union and its eastern neighbours. It is also our intention to develop the network further, following the launch of our website, to organize a short course of in-country training in European integration for Ukrainian civil servants and to increase published output. Our next annual conference may be held in Brussels in 2007. We owe a debt of thanks to all our sponsors, on whose generous assistance the Wider Europe Programme relies.
Fourth International Workshop on Strategic Elites and EU Enlargement
Reactions by, and the Prospects for, East European States Currently Left Out

Lyubka Savkova

A two day workshop on elites and EU enlargement concerning aspiring as well as actual EU member states took place on the 6-7 October in Kiev, Ukraine. The workshop was fourth in a series of similar events organized annually by Dr. David Lane from the University of Cambridge who coordinates a network of scholars for the study of strategic elites in Europe. Previous events have taken place in Budapest, Bremen and Prague and there are planned workshops in Vienna and Cambridge in 2007 and 2008 respectively.

Political stability, democratic consolidation and further progression of social and economic reforms in Central and Eastern Europe are conditions of successful European integration. They depend vitally on the structure and orientations of the contemporary elites, which have played crucial intermediating roles in structuring policies towards European enlargement.

The aim of the Kiev workshop was to focus on their characteristics, orientations and actions with regard to enlargement; their expectations and reactions; and implications for policy. Moreover, the workshop had an objective to clarify alternative political strategies that might be pursued to further elite integration in the various countries or, alternatively, the possibility of the development of political linkages with other states (members of the former Soviet Union and Muslim societies) and conceivable systemic conflict both within and between member states and those excluded.

The workshop gathered about 25 paper givers from 10 countries as well as participants from the Ukrainian political elite such as the foreign minister of Ukraine Boris Tarasyuk and the head of the Federation of Employers in the country Vladimir Grishchenko. Delegates from the UK included among others Geoffrey Pridham with a paper on “Elite attitudes, Political Will and Political Capacity in the Further Enlargement of the EU: the case of Romania”; Stephen White on “Strategic Elites and a Wider Europe: the cases of Russia, Belarus and Ukraine; and David Lane on “The 2004 Enlargement and after: what prospects for Ukraine?” . From the University of Sussex Lyubka Savkova presented a paper on the “Trajectory of Consensus: Europe as a Valence Issue in Bulgarian Politics before Accession”.

European Studies Research Students’ Conference: a valuable experience

Anya Dahmani

On Monday 13th November 2006 a one-day conference on “how to do a PhD” was held in London, organised by the UACES Student Forum. The conference was attended by three SEI students. The one day event was a great opportunity for PhD students to develop an understanding of several important issues related to doing a PhD. Between 30 to 40 students from universities throughout Britain, attended the conference. All those attending were working on EU related research topics, covering a wide spectrum of European issues). The day started with a very engaging keynote speech given by Lord Williamson of Horton, Former Secretary-General of the European Commission 1987-1997. Lord Williamson’s presentation consisted of an historical overview of the construction of the EU including anecdotes that allowed us to better understand the situation back then and gave us profitable insights into the challenges facing the EU nowadays.

The day then took a more practical turn with panel sessions on how to manage the different stages of a PhD. These presentations were given by two people, Katerina Tsoukala, University of Sussex and Alex War-
leigh-Lack, Brunel University, Chair of UACES, their respective positions allowed them to present converging as well as diverging viewpoints on PhD management issues. The presenters provided valuable insights and constructive warnings regarding how to best manage our work in order to successfully complete our PhDs.

At the same time another panel discussion took place addressing the issue of finishing a PhD. Fewer people attended it, which was simply due to the technicality of the audience being mainly composed of 1st or 2nd year PhD students - when the final year of PhD completion - may still seem far away...

Following those panel sessions, a very creative session on networking took place that borrowed its structure from the concept of speed-dating. The session was amusing and most certainly unexpected. This allowed about 12 people to present both themselves as well as their research to fellow PhD Students within 3 minutes.

The afternoon started with the UACES elections. From which SEI DPhil student John Fitzgibbon was elected as a member of the Committee of the UACES Student Forum. After the elections there was a session run on managing the stages of your PhD and an extremely interesting panel session on finding e-resources, the speakers gave very useful information (some of which can be found on the UACES webpage: http://www.uacesstudentforum.org/nucleus/media/1/20061116-e-resources.pdf)

The speakers were extremely dynamic and resourceful regarding the different official EU websites and other websites. It was certainly my favourite moment of the day. The conference came to an end with a roundtable on "After the PhD"; this roundtable was composed of Professor Whitman who has experienced both academia and think tank work. A staff member of the European Personnel Selection Office also participated. He discussed post-PhD employment possibilities within the EU. I think this last roundtable was an important element of the day since future employment is obviously the crucial question for anyone doing a PhD.

This conference was certainly well worth attending for any PhD student starting out on their work, it is fruitful and reassuring to interact with other PhD students and furthermore it is a day rich in information, guidelines and reflections. The financial help provided by SEI to attend such meetings is essential and also much appreciated and should be continued.

Ongoing Research

This issue of Euroscope presents reports on the current research projects being worked on by Lucia Quaglia, Alan Mayhew and Visiting Academic Fellow Charles Lees.

News on the Framework 6 Project and EUSA Political economy section

Lucia Quaglia

The Framework Programme 6 project

I am a member of the Framework Programme 6 project Integrated and United: A Quest for European Citizenship (INTUNE). The project, coordinated by the University of Siena, is one of the few Integrated Projects on the theme of Citizenship financed by the European Union. It involves 29 European institutions and over 100 scholars in political science, sociology, public policy, media, linguistics and socio-psychology across Eastern and Western Europe. Its aim is to study the changes in the scope, nature and characteristics of citizenship that result from the process of the deepening and enlargement of the European Union. INTUNE focuses on how integration and disintegration processes at both the national and European level affect three major dimensions of citizenship: identity, representation and scope and standards of good governance. The project is based on three systematic and inter-connecting surveys covering citizens, members of parlia-
ment, and policy experts involved in EU committee governance. I am one of the project partners of the team studying ‘experts’ (i.e., technocratic elites) and together with Prof Kenneth Dyson (University of Cardiff) am focusing on the study macroeconomic elites in the EU.

**EUSA Political economy section**

I have also been participating in a broad research project coordinated by David Howarth (University of Edinburgh) and Tal Sadeh (Tel Aviv University) as part of the activities of the Political Economy section of the European Union Studies Association (EUSA). The project, which brings together academics from all over Europe and the US, explores the role of economic interests in the ‘construction of Europe’ by looking at different policy areas and institutional issues. My research focuses on the role of interest groups and more generally the private sector in financial services regulation and supervision in the EU. From this research I presented a paper entitled ‘Setting the pace? Private financial interests and European financial market integration’ at the weekly SEI research seminar in October. This work is now available as an SEI working paper.

---

**The ‘Better Regulation’ Agenda and the new EU Member States**

**Alan Mayhew**

‘Better regulation’ is the term which has been coined for a policy which aims at raising the quality of regulation throughout Europe to avoid unnecessary costs and create rather more transparency for businesses and citizens. ‘Better regulation’ is an important part of the policies contained in the Lisbon Agenda for Growth and Jobs in the EU, which recommends that all Member States implement such a policy. The European Commission and some member states are trying to impose this policy on their administrations, with mixed success.

Improving the quality of regulation involves most of the areas of public administration – the Parliament, the Executive, the Judiciary – as well as wide circles of operators in the Community. The objective is to ensure that when decisions are made on regulation the impact of the regulation is well-known and understood by those taking the decision. The main tools used are regulatory impact assessment, simplification and effective implementation.

A policy is not easy to implement and unless there is firm pressure maintained on the administration by the senior levels in Government, the policy will fail. The Executive is often to blame because it does not want to perform the sometimes time-consuming preparation of legislation under ‘the Better Regulation’ framework. Parliaments also frequently think that their prerogatives are being limited by considerations of cost and efficiency.

The United Kingdom is perhaps the member state with the most developed policy, closely followed by the Dutch. However in many old EU Members the policy must be considered a partial failure. The SIGMA Group at OECD has been analysing the development of ‘Better Regulation’ policies in the new Member States. Having worked on the origins of this policy in the European Commission 15 years ago and with experience of central and eastern Europe, I was invited to be a ‘Peer’ for this exercise.

Our reports will be appearing soon – a general report and individual country reports. ‘Better regulation’ policy is not something that comes naturally in the new Member States, although all of them have introduced elements of it. We frequently found that while a small elite group, often in the Prime Minister’s Office, was working to design and implement the policy, there was total ignorance of it and of the tools it uses in line ministries.

However these are early days and there are signs that the policy may be catching on in some of the countries. And it is worth noting that a former Sussex student, Małgorzata Kalużyńska, is the Director in charge of the policy in Warsaw!
SEI Visiting Fellow Lands Major Research Grant

Dr Charles Lees
Visiting Academic Fellow

Working as part of a Sheffield-based team I have secured a major research grant (£280,000) from the Economic and Social Research Council to study institutional change in South East Europe. Other investigators in the project, which is to be located within the Centre for International Policy Research at the Department of Politics at Sheffield, are Professor Andrew Taylor, Dr Ian Bache, and Professor Andrew Geddes. The project will be conducted jointly with the South East European Research Centre (SEERC), collaboration between the University of Sheffield and City University, Thessaloniki, Greece.

This project asks if political engagement with the European Union (EU) has changed the nature of domestic policy-making and promoted ‘multi-level governance’: a growing interdependence between governmental and non-governmental actors across national, subnational and international levels.

The project examines developments between 1995 and 2007 in four south east European countries, whose engagement with the EU is at different stages: one state that has been a member of the EU throughout the period (Greece); one that joined roughly midway through the period being studied (Slovenia), another that is projected to join (Croatia); and one that has a prospect of membership (Macedonia).

The project compares the changing nature of domestic policy-making in relation to three areas of policy: social and economic cohesion; environment; and migration and population movement. Each policy area is important to the development of the region and raises important political issues. Moreover, each has a significant cross-national dimension and in which there is a significant EU competence. This raises the potential for multi-level governance.

Research Student Report

SEI DPhil student John Fitzgibbon reflects on his first term in SEI and SEI’s series of Professional Development Workshops.

‘An active Research Community’
John Fitzgibbon

If I could choose one word to summarise my first semester in the Sussex European Institute then it would be involvement. When entering into a Doctoral programme one is warned of the loneliness of spending so many hours working in isolation. Of the majority of supervisors who examine your work once a semester and discuss everything but your work and scoff when you ask for more support.

After a term at the SEI however I have found the opposite to be true. Each morning my email inbox fills up with encouragements to submit papers, attend conferences, come along to seminar briefings and participate in researcher workshops. The effort at the SEI is geared toward fostering a real and productive research community. Even after just a few months here I already feel that I am an active member of that community. In the first year of a DPhil so much time is spent grappling with the topic and formulating a research hypothesis that it can be easy to work on this in isolation. Here at the SEI we are encouraged to share our ideas with all the members of the faculty, criticism here only takes the constructive form.

Perhaps the most interesting and beneficial workshops have been a series of Professional Development Workshops run by SEI. These sessions have aim to help research students acquire skills vital to the development of their research and their careers. Dan Hough and James Hampshire briefed us on how important it is to get
your DPhil published as a book and how to go about it. Aleks Szczerbiak and Paul Taggart helped us to layout a timetable to complete our research. Sabina Avdagic and Paul Taggart gave us tips on how to present research at conferences and at job interviews. Tim Bale and Paul Webb suggested ways in which to tailor your research to ensure it gets published in academic journals. Such presentations are rather challenging when you have yet to formulate your research hypothesis or even which countries to test it out in. Yet the sessions have been extremely beneficial in directing us to think about the paths we wish to take after our DPhil research and how the decisions you make now affect your opportunities at the crucial post-qualification stage.

Given that I have been assured by everyone that the years will fly past then it is best to start thinking about a job and publishing as soon as possible. Here the SEI wants it’s doctoral students to be ahead of the competition and be focused on life after the DPhil. Being involved in so many seminars, presentations and football matches in the SEI I hope that does not come so soon.

---

**Sussex European Institute**
*(Department of Politics & Contemporary European Studies)*

**Research Student Workshops Spring Term 2006**

This is a series for research students in the SEI aimed at issues of professional development and taking place throughout the Autumn and Spring terms every two weeks. The workshops are designed as informal workshops with faculty and researchers and are aimed at all research students in the SEI.

**Week 2**
Workshop 5: *Elite Interviewing*
Lucia Quaglia

**Week 4**
Workshop 6: *Preparing for your Viva*
Paul Taggart and Sally Marthaler

**Week 6**
Workshop 7: *Getting an Academic Job*
Shamit Saggar

**Week 8**
Workshop 8: *Accessing European Institutions*
Jim Rollo and Alan Mayhew

For more information please contact Paul Taggart: P.A.Taggart@sussex.ac.uk

In addition to this, SEI Research Students are also organising a series of seminars to provide them with an extra opportunity (in addition to Research in Progress Seminars) to present their research designs and findings and to raise broader issues concerning the doctoral process for discussion.

The seminars will take place on alternate Fridays at 4pm (weeks 2,4,6,8,10, room TBC). The programme and invitations will be sent to SEI students and staff when the timetable is finalised. For more information contact Ed Phelps: E.Phelps@sussex.ac.uk
‘Post-Accession Central Europe’

Professor Paul Lewis
Open University and Visiting Academic Fellow

For the past year or so I have, amongst other things, been busy getting a book published on The European Union and Party Politics in Central and Eastern Europe. This is the first product of a British Academy-funded Research Network I direct on The Impact of the EU on Party Systems and Electoral Alignments in Central Europe. Apart from chapters by members of the central network – Zdenka Mansfeldova, Zsolt Enyedi, Radoslaw Markowski and Alenka Krasovec (from the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and Slovenia respectively) – it also includes contributions on Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Slovakia, Bulgaria and Romania. It is closely linked with the interests of a number of members of the new Department of Politics and Contemporary European Studies at Sussex and has benefited both from the seminars organised by the former network on Opposing Europe and the continuing series of briefings by the Sussex-based European Parties, Elections and Referendums Network (EPERN). Several papers prepared during the production of the book (published by Palgrave Macmillan in November 2006) have been delivered at meetings in Sussex.

What have been the main impacts of EU accession on the party politics of the countries of Central and Eastern Europe? Not surprisingly, there is no clear answer to this question. Five legislative elections were held in the region between September 2005 and October 2006, and as usual the results were mixed. Nationalistic, Eurosceptic parties scored well in Poland although, once installed as a coalition government, their various representatives decided that national interests were well served by taking advantage of the EU benefits on offer and the Eurosceptic stance receded into the background. A left-wing populist party, Smer, did well in Slovakia but this was not so much in reaction to EU policy and the dominance of the ‘social model’ as to opposition to the neo-liberal, flat tax-based policy of the previous government. EU representatives were, however, less pleased with the coalition the party then formed with extremist Slovak Nationalists, and in a dramatic move Smer’s membership of the Party of European Socialists was suspended soon after the new government was formed. The Eurosceptic Civic Democratic Party did well in the Czech Republic, but this had little to do with the party’s attitudes to the EU as these were toned down in recognition of the largely pro-European views of the Czech electorate. Things went well for the Hungarian Socialists who registered an unusual success in the Central European context by gaining re-election. Things began to unravel, though, when the prime minister told his backbenchers that this notable success had been achieved on the basis of substantial lies about the economy. Major demonstrations against the new government were then organised not just by the right-wing opposition but also by Hungarians affected by the major budgetary cuts made to bring the economy into line with accepted EU guidelines.

All this clearly took place in a new EU context, although whether the EU as such has made much impact on the party politics of these countries is another matter. Rather surprisingly, the various EU authorities seem to have rather less influence on Central European parties now they are in the Union than they did before. Smer would not have got away with forming a governing coalition with Slovak Nationalists before accession – or if it had the EU would have expressed its profound displeasure as it did during the 1990s in relations with the Mečiar government and taken steps accordingly. The homophobic utterances of Polish and Latvian parties have
not gone down well in Europe and would have been a definite minus in the accession process. The praise expressed by a leading Polish MEP for General Franco as outstanding European Catholic also strikes a somewhat discordant note. The resurgent populist forces of the region have, however, generally stayed within the bounds of the permissible, and these have themselves become considerably broader with the rise of anti-immigrant forces and a populist right in a number of West European countries, as well as the Eurosceptic tendencies that became apparent at the time of the Constitution referendums in France and the Netherlands. The influence of the EU on the party politics of the Central European countries may therefore be somewhat greater than it first appears – although it may not be such an a positive phenomenon as originally expected, either. This will be a matter for much future discussion in the Sussex European Institute and elsewhere in the Network I am involved with.

‘Working at the World Bank’

Dr Indira Konjhodzic
Senior Operations Officer at the World Bank and SEI Visiting Practitioner Fellow

Funny – being stopped by an American couple asking directions to 19th street. I guess I must have had that look of someone knowing the city. It is now over two years that I ‘moved’ from the World Bank office in Croatia to its Headquarters in Washington. But, before giving you more details on what I do in the World Bank, perhaps a few sentences about the Bank’s organizational structure may be useful.

The ultimate policy-making body of the Bank is the Board of Governors. It comprises of 184 member countries, with Governors usually being ministers of finance or ministers of development. The governors, who meet on an annual basis, delegate specific duties to 24 Executive Directors. The Executive Directors (based in Washington) make up the Boards of Directors, overseeing the bank’s business, including approval of loans and guarantees, new policies, the administrative budget, country assistance strategies and borrowing and financial decisions. The Bank operates day-to-day under the leadership and direction of the president, management and senior staff, and the vice presidents in charge of regions, sectors, networks and functions. There are six regions in the Bank: Africa, Middle East and North Africa, East Asia and Pacific, Europe and Central Asia, Latin America and Caribbean and South Asia.

I work in Europe and Central Asia region (29 countries). While in Zagreb, I focused on Croatia’s structural and other reforms, including those linked with the process of European integration. Arriving in Washington, the focus shifted to something different.

Firstly, I immersed myself into public expenditure reforms in transition countries, focusing not on what needs to be done but primarily on what influences prospects for actually doing it. The initial impetus for reforms in transition countries was largely provided by the need to restore and control fiscal balances. The reform agenda gradually extended to include public expenditure management (PEM) seeking to strengthen its instrumental role in maintaining aggregate fiscal discipline, strategic allocation of resources, and promoting the efficient delivery of services.

The process of European integration has provided an additional impetus in the countries acceding to the EU, both regarding PEM and the volume and the nature of the state involvement. Secondly, I was lucky to become involved in a major analytical work on Turkey (Turkey Country Economic Memorandum), focusing on reforms for rapid and sustainable growth within the broader framework of European integration. With those tasks completed, I moved to the other, equally interesting, side of the Bank – the business side. It is fascinating to be able to participate and observe how this global organization manages and runs its operations.

In my current assignment, I have several
tasks. The most important one is to make projections for, and monitor, the work program (lending and non-lending operations) at the level of the region as a whole. My further task is to review country assistance strategies, both in terms of substance and their funding. I also provide training to the Bank staff on relevant business policies and procedures.

My colleagues come from all over the world. One day, out of curiosity, we counted how many nationalities were sitting around the table – there were eleven of us and we counted eight nationalities. I love it. This cultural diversity is complemented by diverse ideas, knowledge and experiences. Bringing together that global knowledge and experience to focus on a particular country or issue, is always an interesting experience. Every project or analytical study is reviewed and commented by a number of people, from different units and often times from different regions of the Bank. Usually such reviews take place in the early stages of the project or study, so to help sharpen its relevance, focus and objectives, and close to its completion with a view of enhancing its quality. Frequently external experts and organizations are invited to participate and contribute to such reviews.

I should mention the good cooperation between the Bank and the European Commission on a range of countries and varying from being project or program based to policy- or study/report related. For instance, the Bank consults the EC when preparing Country Economic Memorandum (one of major analytical works, analyzing key developmental challenges of a country and suggesting necessary policy reforms) for countries involved in the process of European integration. I was privileged to participate in two such consultations – for Croatia CEM and Turkey CEM.

Meeting the EC representatives to discuss Croatia’s developmental challenges and constraints was such an interesting experience for me, for several reasons. Firstly, we discussed Croatia’s developmental challenges, and I am a Croat. Secondly, the EC representatives we met were the same people that I used to deal with while working for the Government of Croatia. Moreover, some of them were my counterparts during the negotiations of the Stabilization and Association Agreement. In addition, for my colleagues that was the first visit to the EC. I just could not resist but pretended to be ‘at home there’, telling everyone of my first visit to the EC as the postgraduate student at the SEI. Of course, I spared no details on the good reputation of the SEI and how lucky I was to do my postgraduate degrees there. Honestly, I hoped for, but had no idea how much the SEI education would actually help to create many exciting career opportunities for me.

‘My Stay as a Visiting Student at the European University Institute, in Florence’

Simona Guerra
SEI DPhil Student

It is with a bit of nostalgia that I think back of my four months at the European University Institute, spent at a special moment for the Institute, celebrating its thirty year anniversary. As a Visiting Student I enjoyed the Institute as any PhD student would do, attending seminars, workshops, conferences, and consulting the rich Library and precious Archive. Further, it is possible to make use of the Institute’s generous printing and photocopying facilities and the library lets you borrow up to 50 books at one time, making me feel like the luckiest person on earth.

You can breathe in excellence everywhere here. On the first day Nancy Altobelli, of the Academic Service, welcomed the arrival of all the new students with brochures and leaflets and a chat on Florence and the Institute. Marie- Ange Catotti, the coordinator of the Social and Political Sciences Department, added another small brochure and information on the department and seminars available.

Badia Fiesolana
Peter Kennealy, the Library’s Information Specialist, provided an introductory course for new users, like me.

It was useful to begin my stay together with the new first year students, so that I could benefit from the presentations on seminars and meetings: the enthusiasm led me to register for four courses. In order to find time for my research, I had to give up one, but I found it difficult to choose which one it would be. At the beginning of October there was the introduction to the seminars with the EUI professors’ presentations, Post-Doc Fellows, Braudel fellows, Max Weber Fellows and Visiting Fellows. The possibility of exchanging a few ideas afterwards introduced me to people specialising in different fields.

The EUDO (European Union Democracy Observatory) and Departmental Seminars had special speakers including Claes de Vreese and Robert Ladrech. While I was there, Jösef Borrell, President of the European Parliament, Jerzy Hausner, Polish former Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Economy, Labour and Social Affairs, Massimo D’Alema, Italian Foreign Minister, and Giorgio Napolitano, President of the Italian Republic visited the Institute and gave a talk.

Further, the Institute organized, together with the Gabinetto Scientifico Letterario G. P. Vieusseux, a two-day event on Europe held in the magnificent Salone dei Duecento in Palazzo Vecchio in Florence, where I could see together some of the Fathers of Europe and distinguished speakers: Valéry Giscard d’Estaing, Helmut Schmidt, Joschka Fischer, Jorge Sampaio, Costas Simitis, Carlo Azeglio Ciampi, and Jacques Ziller, Marcello De Cecco and many others. Finally, Professor Mark Franklin organized a conference where I could meet and listen to Prof. Mikolai Czesnik, Dr. Jeffrey Karp, Prof. Paul Whiteley, Prof. Wouter van der Brug, Prof. Raymond Duch, Dr. Stephen Fischer, Prof. David Denver, Prof. Cees van der Eijk, Prof. Michael Marsh, Prof. Dennis Quinn, Prof. James Stimson and Prof. Christopher Wlezien.

I am sure that I am forgetting something or someone, but it is really impossible to comprise these wonderful four months in just a few words. It was one of the most enriching experiences in my DPhil years and I thank the European University Institute for this and especially its President, Professor Yves Mény, the director of the SPS department, Professor Michael Keating and my supervisor in the department, Professor Mark Franklin. I must also thank those professors I met, for allowing me to attend their seminars and for the advice they gave to me for my research, these people include Professor Adrienne Héritier, Professor Peter Mair, Professor Alexander Trechsel and Professor Donatella Della Porta. With special thanks to Gabriella Unger and Dr. Ulrich Sedelmier.

‘Researching Regionalist Parties in Italy and the UK’

Emanuele Massetti
SEI DPhil Student

I started my PhD at the Sussex European Institute in 2004, under the supervision of Paul Webb and Tim Bale. My research project is a comparative study of regionalist parties in Italy and in the UK. In particular, I am interested in how these parties change their policy positions on salient policy dimensions, such as constitutional policy, European integration and the left-right spectrum, on the basis of wider strategic choices. In September 2006 I started my ‘fieldwork’ on two British cases. First I went to Swansea to attend the Annual Conference of Plaid Cymru (PC) and then I moved to Scotland where I attended the Annual Conference of the Scottish National Party (in Perth), researched party documents at the National Library of Scotland and conducted interviews with senior SNP members and Members of the Scottish Parliament (MSPs).

In mid November I came back to Sussex, where I spent few days for a supervisory meeting and for recharging my batteries. Then I went to Wales, spending a week in Aberystwyth doing research at the National Library of Wales and then four weeks in Car-
diff conducting interviews with PC’s Assembly Members (AMs). At the moment of writing this report I have not yet finished my research in Wales, despite this I can say that I am satisfied with the material I gathered and I really enjoyed the overall research experience. In Scotland I was able to interview eleven SNP MSPs (including a former party leader, the party chairman and the Parliament Proceeding Officer) and a retired former leader of the party. In Wales I met (or I have scheduled to meet) seven PC’s AMs (including a former party leader and the Assembly Proceeding Officer) and the Chief Executive of the party, plus I arranged to interview two MPs in London next January. In addition to this, the data collected from the parties’ archives in the two respective National Libraries is very interesting and useful for meeting the aims of my research.

This positive evaluation does not mean that everything went perfectly well. There are some little stories that I am slightly ashamed to tell, including the time that I pressed “play” instead of “record” on my tape recorder, so that the whole interview was not recorded! (fortunately I was taking notes). However, I regard the whole research experience, including the mistakes, as highly formative. There are many things that one can learn. I will point to five practical considerations/suggestions that may help students who are about to start their fieldwork. Firstly, it is very important to plan your research ahead. Make sure that you are relatively free from other commitments during your research. There are a number of logistical problems to be sorted out, not least the accommodation. If you are using elite interviews make sure you do not choose a busy period (for the interviewees) such as electoral campaigns and approach your potential interviewees well in advance.

Secondly, it is very useful to be based in a University, when possible. This might solve some of the logistical problems (workspace, computer etc.), might give you the opportunity to make your research known and to meet people that can help you with your research. Fortunately, I could be based at the University of Edinburgh, Aberystwyth and Cardiff.

Thirdly, it is very helpful to use previous contacts to plan your research and it is very important to make more contacts while you are doing fieldwork. If you are a young researcher you might not have developed a network yet. Use the contacts of your supervisors or of the staff in your Department. I was introduced to the Universities of Edinburgh and Aberystwyth by Dan Hough and Paul Webb respectively.

Fourthly, when you go for an interview it is crucial to be well prepared on both the topic and the interviewee, and to show him/her you are prepared by quoting things s/he said or authoritative scholars who wrote on the subject under discussion. This will make your interlocutor understand that you are not there to be introduced to the topic but, rather, to get precise information.

Finally, do not forget that spending weeks or months out for research is also a human experience. Try to find an accommodation with local people of the same age as yours. This will help you enjoying the place and avoiding feeling isolated. I had good time in Edinburgh where I shared a private accommodation with two Scottish guys, while I feel rather lonely here in Cardiff, staying alone in an empty University managed flat. Fortunately, it is almost time to return back home to Sussex (after spending Christmas holiday in my beloved Perugia!).

SEI DPhil student
Emanuele Massetti
The Sussex European Institute (SEI) and Department of Politics and Contemporary European Studies offers a number of doctoral scholarship opportunities for students starting in autumn 2007.

ESRC Studentship Applications

We welcome applications from potential doctoral students interested in applying for ESRC 1+3 and +3 Studentships through the University of Sussex. Specifically:

- We will be nominating candidates for the three ESRC 1+3 Quota Awards offered by the University of Sussex School of Social Sciences and Cultural Studies which will be allocated in spring 2007.

- We will also be nominating candidates for the School of Social Sciences and Cultural Studies’ entries in the ESRC 1+3/+3 Open Competition. The School can enter up to six candidates for this competition. Applicants for +3 Awards must already be taking, or have successfully completed, an ESRC recognised research training Masters at Sussex or at another institution.

We especially welcome candidates wishing to conduct research in the following areas of our core research expertise:

- **Comparative Politics** - particularly the comparative study of political parties, public policy and comparative European politics.

- **European Integration** - particularly European political integration, the political economy of European integration, European security and EU external policy and the domestic politics of European integration, including Euroscepticism.

- **British Politics** - particularly party politics, public policy and the politics of migration.

- **Citizenship and Migration** - particularly the politics of race and ethnicity.

Please note that ESRC Studentships are only open to applicants from the UK (fees and bursary) and other EU countries (fees only).

Politics and Contemporary European Studies Graduate Teaching Studentships

In addition, the Department of Politics and Contemporary European Studies will also be allocating up to TWO three-year teaching studentships for students starting in autumn 2007.

These studentships cover tuition fees up to the level paid by UK/EU students for up to three years for Full-Time students (arrangements can also be made for Part-Time applicants). Successful candidates are required to provide the equivalent of 150 hours of teaching, to be completed within four years of starting their DPhil, subject to departmental requirements and their own expertise. They will also be eligible to apply for further teaching, paid at standard University rates.

We particularly welcome applicants with an ability to teach Political Theory and Contemporary European Studies, although applicants who are able to teach British Politics and Comparative Politics will also be considered.

Studentships will be subject to satisfactory progress on research through the normal annual review processes, and satisfactory teaching performance.

Where possible, candidates are also expected to be applying at the same time for research funding from other research councils, e.g. the ESRC if the timing is appropri-
ate, and if successful, are expected to accept that award in preference to a Studentship.

**Lady Monica Cockfield Scholarships in Contemporary European Studies**

The Sussex European Institute also offers **one doctoral scholarship in Contemporary European Studies** for students pursuing research in the field of European integration starting in autumn 2007.

The scholarship covers tuition fees up to the level paid by UK/EU students for up to three years for Full-Time students.

These scholarships are aimed specifically at students whose research focuses on the mainstream of European economic and political integration and the issues confronting a post-enlargement EU at the EU-level.

For further information about these scholarships please contact: Professor Paul Taggart for further details:  
[P.A.Taggart@sussex.ac.uk](mailto:P.A.Taggart@sussex.ac.uk)

Applications for all of these studentships are also welcome from those already registered for a DPhil at Sussex.