

Message from the Co-Director

Another academic year begins and we welcome a new cohort of Masters and Doctoral students to SEI. They join the ranks of more than 500 students of European integration who have passed through SEI since it began its work under the direction of Professor Helen Wallace in 1992.

In those 15 years much has happened in Europe and the world on which SEI has been involved in analysing and researching. In Europe the countries of Central Europe have moved from tentative partners of an EU of 12 to full members of an EU of 27. The countries of the former Yugoslavia have gone through horrific conflict and emerged into a hard earned and delicate, not to say uneasy, peace in which actual (for Slovenia) and potential (Croatia and FYROM as candidates and the other countries of the Stability Pact) integration into the EU has offered and offers still the main, not to say only, sustainable path out of the destruction and violence. The SEI has made its small contribution to these events notably through research and commentary and training and perhaps most of all as an exemplar of the humanist, liberal and democ-

cratic values which lie at the heart of academic endeavours and also the creation of modern integrated Europe.

There are many people to thank for the creation and sustenance of SEI. The founding staff notably Helen Wallace and Mary Kaldor for setting its initial values; two former Vice Chancellors, Leslie Fielding and Alasdair Smith who gave it its initial impetus as well as continuing support; subsequent co-directors and staff, both faculty and administrative, inside of SEI and in other parts of the university; and students as they have gone out into the world and we believe made a difference. But I also feel strongly that the particular structure and success of SEI depended and depends on its situation in the University of Sussex. It grew out of tradition of interdisciplinary scholarship of Europe that dated from the University's founding. Even if that tradition has had to adapt to the strictures of modern academic life I feel it survives in SEI and will help carry SEI into another 15 years of endeavour and success.

A theme of the work of SEI down the years has been the economic impact of European integration. This work at Sussex predates SEI's founding. Francois Duchene pioneered analysis of it in the 1970's. Above all colleagues in the economics department played a significant role in the ground breaking economic analysis that underlay the effort to complete the single market and in particular the Cecchini report which issued 20 years ago, but also subsequently. Alasdair Smith, Peter Holmes and Michael Gasiorek in particular were and



Professor Jim Rollo

Inside	page
◆ SEI Diary	3
◆ New Appointment	8
◆ SEI Working Papers	8
◆ EPERN Briefing Papers	10
◆ SEI RIP Seminar Timetable	11
◆ Politics Seminar Timetable	13
◆ <i>Feature: The Reform Treaty</i>	14
◆ SEI Student Reports	16
◆ Conferences and Seminars	18
◆ Ongoing Research	25
◆ SEI Dispatches	29
◆ SEI Researcher Professional Development Workshops	32

are active in this field. More the practice and outcomes of European economic integration has had an important impact on economists' understanding of the process economic integration more generally. SEI held a conference on 16 and 17 July to reflect on what social scientists and economists in particular have learned from 50 years of the European enterprise and 20 years after the Cecchini report and *inter alia* 15 years of the SEI. The conference details are reported upon elsewhere in this edition of Euroscope and on the SEI website. I will not say more about the conference per se but would underscore that it was not simply an exercise in looking back. It was rather an attempt at clearing the ground as a precursor to moving forward. The deep economic integration (meaning above all regulatory integration and liberalisation) that characterises the EU is increasingly part of the agenda in the WTO but is also at the heart of the regional trading arrangements that are such a prominent part of the global economic integration scene. These RTA increasingly involve developing countries some with relatively weak economic, administrative and legal institutions. We do not properly understand the relationship between such deep integration and economic growth and development. Consideration of this question is at the heart of the economic policy research agenda in SEI and at CARIS (Centre for the Analysis of Regional Integration at Sussex directed by Michael Gasiorek).

The German Presidency which ended on 30 June must be judged a significant success. A European position on Climate change was agreed which seemed to catch the public and media mood and generated a relatively rare good news story for the Union. Unfortunately the gains were not reinforced by matching agreement at the G8 where Germany was also in the chair but that was probably inevitable given US attitudes and the reluctance of the emerging powers of China, India and Brazil to sacrifice their economic development to a problem largely generated by the behaviour of the now developed countries since the industrial revolution. The other major success of the German Presidency was to get agreement both to a text of a new treaty to replace the ill-fated Constitutional Treaty which was lost after the no votes in France and the Netherlands. This was no mean feat give the French presidential election, the messy handover of power from Blair to Brown in Britain and the febrile na-

ture of domestic politics and European policy in Poland. To have got agreement to a quick IGC and a commitment to a ratification process that avoided referendums in the UK and France and as it turned out in the Netherlands in addition brings this achievement close to a diplomatic triumph. For further reflections on the German presidency see SEI Working Paper No.97 by Lucia Quaglia, Dan Hough and Alan Mayhew.

Polish relations with the EU will be the subject of a seminar at the Polish embassy in London on 16 and 17 November sponsored jointly by SEI and the European Research institute at Birmingham. The results of the snap election in Poland on future relations and indeed on the IGC negotiations will no doubt feature in this seminar. There will also be a strong Polish presence in the SEI Research in Progress (RIP) Seminars with Prof Jaroslav Pietras (one of SEI's distinguished Practitioner Fellows) on the EU Budget on 9 October and Dr Jacek Kucharczyk on Polish Populism on 13 November.

A key element in the ability of the German presidency to move the treaty negotiations forward was the election of Nicolas Sarkozy as President of France. A round table on the first 6 months of Sarkozy's administration led by Dr Sally Marthaler will take place on 27 November as part of SEI's RIP series.

Finally as we go to press speculation is again rife of an early general election in Britain. Whatever the calculation around this, if it happens, it will no doubt give Gordon Brown the opportunity to rescind the 2005 labour election promise to hold a referendum on the constitutional Treaty. Many, and not just those on the Eurosceptic side of the argument, have been pushing for the commitment to a referendum to be applied to the new draft treaty. Wrapping up popular approval of the new treaty in a general election campaign would neatly shoot the referendum fox. Of course if it became a major negative for Labour in the campaign then the commitment could just as easily become entrenched with potentially serious implications for the draft treaty and even Britain's position in the Union.

It all promises an interesting autumn in Europe and in SEI...

Prof Jim Rollo

SEI Diary

During the spring and summer of 2007 members of SEI have been involved in many memorable activities connected to teaching and research on contemporary Europe.

April: EU Consent

The 3rd EU-CONSENT PhD School was held between 23-26 April, and a conference on CFSP took place titled: Issues of Representation and Responsibility between 26-27 April 2007. SEI was a founding partner, in 2005, of the EU-funded EU-CONSENT network of excellence. This promotes joint research and education activities among participating partners.

The current 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 holding working group conferences, EU-CONSENT also emphasises the advancement of doctoral students from participating



partners. To this end, it is running a series of PHD Schools. SEI's Katerina Tsoukala attended one in Lisbon, while Rose Azzopardi and Rasa Spokeviciute went to another in Dublin.

EU-CONSENT, funded Adrian Treacher's participation at the European Union Studies Association (EUSA) conference on 'The impact of enlargement on the EU as an external actor' in Montreal in May. Adrian will also be attending EU-Consent's Third Annual Plenary Conference in Brussels in October. You can find out more about EU-CONSENT at www.eu-consent.net.

In April Lucia Quaglia presented a paper entitled 'The Bank of Italy between Europeanisation and Globalisation' at a workshop organised by Prof Kenneth Dyson (University of Cardiff) at the Hilton Hotel in Cardiff. This paper will be published as a chapter in K. Dyson and M. Marcussen *The Changing World of Central Banking*, OUP: Oxford (forthcoming).

Aleks Szczerbiak gave a paper on "Why do Poles love the EU - but not (necessarily) the constitutional treaty?" in April at Loughborough University's Department of Politics, International Relations and European Studies in their research seminar series.

On 24-25 April Lucia Quaglia attended the FP6 INTUNE meeting in Paris to discuss progress on the project's fieldwork.

May: Lord Kinnock Visit

On 8 May former Labour Party leader Neil Kinnock spoke in a question-and-answer session organised by the University of Sussex's Politics Society. Lord Kinnock shared his views on Tony Blair's future career prospects and answered questions on topical issues including the recent local elections, the war in Iraq, the Falklands, Margaret Thatcher's premiership and ID cards.

Students and staff crowded into the Arts A1 lecture theatre to hear Lord Kinnock's address. The University of Sussex's Politics Society has welcomed several guest speakers this year including Tony Blair's former advisor on the European Union and the United Kingdom's Permanent Representative to the European Union Sir Stephen Wall.

During May, Aleks Szczerbiak gave a talk on "Searching for order in chaos? The experience of researching Polish politics as a UK-based 'Polish' political scientist," at the Embassy of the Republic of Poland, Consulate General, Institute of European Culture PUNO and the Federation of Poles in Great Britain conference on 'The Polish Contribution to British Science and Culture' held at the Polish Embassy in London.

Paul Taggart gave a paper at the Department of Politics at the University of Cambridge on "Roles and Representations: The New Members of the European Parliament" in May.

Congratulations go to SEI



Lord Kinnock pictured with Professor Paul Webb (left), Head of the Department of Politics and Contemporary European Studies and Politics student Laurie Erlam (right),

doctoral student Nat Copey for completing and successfully defending his doctoral thesis on 'Foreign Policy and Public Opinion in the Polish-Ukrainian Borderlands' in May.

In May SEI scholars Sue Collard, Sally Marthaler and Adrian Treacher held a roundtable discussion on the 'French Presidential Election' as part of the SEI's summer term Research in Progress Seminars.

On the 11th of May SEI held a conference titled "*The Successful Laggard: Opportunities and Challenges from Bulgaria's Membership to the European Union*" to discuss Bulgaria's accession to the European Union in January. The conference was attended by academics including Julian Popov from the *Bulgarian School of Politics* as well diplomats and politicians including Bulgaria's Ambassador to the UK Dr Luchezar Matev and European Commission member Helwise Elfferich. SEI doc-

toral student Lyubka Savkova reviews the event on page 18.

On 22 May Tim Bale attended a workshop at the University of Cambridge held by the contributing authors to a special edition of the *Journal of European Public Policy* on centre right parties, immigration and integration in Europe. The publication will be edited by Tim and arose from his ESRC Seminar Series on the 'Contemporary Right in Europe'. It will be out in early 2008.

Jim Rollo spoke about the agenda for the EU budget at the Institute for World Economy on the 18-19 May and was a commentator at the conference on 'Ten years of European Monetary Union' at the British Academy on May 23.

On 24-26 May Lucia Quaglia presented a paper entitled 'Italy in the Eurozone: Surviving the First Decade' at a conference organised at the

British Academy by Prof Kenneth Dyson. The paper is part of a (forthcoming) volume edited by Kenneth Dyson, titled *European States and the Euro*, OUP: Oxford.

Paul Webb and Tim Bale attended the Connex Thematic Conference on Political Representation at the European University Institute in Florence, May 25-26.

In May Mark Bennister attended the ECPR Joint Panel Workshops at Helsinki University. He presented a paper entitled 'Ripping the lattice? How John Howard's dominance impacts on Australia's governance' to the *Political Power in Parliamentary Executives Panel*.

June: Brussels Trip

Students from the M.A. in Contemporary European Studies (MACES) programme visited Brussels with Jim Rollo and Lucia Quaglia on a field trip in June. The trip included meetings with members of the European Council, SEI alumni, SEI Practitioner Fellows and visits to the European Parliament. A report of the trip by MACES student Mette Damsbo can be found on page 16.

In June Aleks Szczerbiak's paper on 'Social Poland' Defeats 'Liberal Poland'? The September-October 2005 Polish Parliamentary and Presidential Elections' was published in the *Journal of Communist Studies and Transition Politics*.

Adrian Treacher spoke at a conference on French military policy funded jointly by Sciences-Po University and

the French Ministry of Defence in Paris.

Paul Taggart attended the Bilderberg Conference in June which was held in Istanbul to present on the panel on 'Populism and Democracy'.

On 12 June, SEI scholars Dan Hough, Alan Mayhew, and Lucia Quaglia spoke at an SEI Roundtable Discussion evaluating the German Presidency of the European Union in 2007. At the roundtable Lucia, Dan and Alan presented part of their new SEI working paper on this topic. See D. Hough, A. Mayhew, L. Quaglia (2007) 'You can't always get what you want, but do you sometimes get what you need? The German presidency of the EU in 2007', *SEI Working Paper no 97*.

On 23-25 June Lucia Quaglia and Dimitris Christopoulos (University of the West of England) presented a paper entitled 'Networks of Policy-Makers: EU Financial Services Regulation' at the conference *Networks in European Governance: Informal Politics 1945-2007*, Urstein/Salzburg (AU).

The paper dealt with the network active in a specific segment of financial services governance in the European Union: the banking regulation network. The first part of the paper discussed the formation, configuration, membership, policy dynamics and legitimacy of the network.

The second part of the paper focused on a key case study: the Capital Requirement Directive (CRD). Formal network analysis was

used to shed light on this case study. This paper will be published in German in an edited volume provisionally entitled "Netzwerke im europäischen Mehrebenensystem - Von 1945 bis zur Gegenwart/Networks in European Multilevel Governance - From 1945 to the present day' published by Böhlau.

In June Jim Rollo presented as part of a team reporting a 'Qualitative Assessment of the EU-Indian Free Trade Area' to the Director General of Trade and the EU council in Brussels.

The 'Jean Monnet Wider Europe Network' which grew out of Professor Alan Mayhew's Jean Monnet Chair, held its Spring meeting at CREES in Birmingham in June. The Network now links the Universities of Sussex, Leiden, Birmingham and the EUI in Florence. It brings together academics from different disciplines and practitioners to analyse the relations between the EU and the countries of Eastern Europe and to contribute to the deepening of these relations.

The Birmingham conference concentrated on the development of the European Neighbourhood Policy and the EU's relations with Russia and the Ukraine, including a session on the new enhanced agreement between the EU and Ukraine.

The Network also organised a panel on the new agreement with Ukraine at the ICCEES meeting at the Humboldt University in Berlin. Christophe Hillion (Leiden), Nat Copsey (Birmingham and Sussex)

and Alan Mayhew (SEI) were joined on the panel by Olga Shumylo (ICPS, Kyiv) and Rainer Lindner (SWP, Berlin).

July: SEI 15th Anniversary Conference

In July SEI celebrated the 50th Anniversary of the Treaty of Rome, the 20th Anniversary of the Cecchini Report and its own fifteenth anniversary by organising a conference on the theme of *What have we learned from European Economic Integration?*

Keynote speakers at the conference included Professor Helen Wallace (European University Institute) who spoke on 'From Economic Community to economic Union: Europe at 50' and Professor Venables (Department for International Development and Oxford University). The conference papers are available at

<http://www.sussex.ac.uk/Units/caris/seiconference/seiconf.html.html>

A review of the two day conference written by Jim Rollo can be found in this issue of Euroscope on page 22.



August: New SEI Working Papers

During the summer term there have been four new additions to the SEI Working Papers series. These are

- Sean Hanley/Aleks Szczerbiak/Tim Haughton/Brigid Fowler
Explaining the success of Centre-Right Parties in Post Communist East Central Europe: A Compara-

tive Analysis

- Dan Hough/ Michael Koss
Territory and Electoral Politics in Germany
- Lucia Quaglia
Committee Governance in the Financial Sector in the European Union
- Lucia Quaglia, Dan Hough and Alan Mayhew
You Can't Always Get What You Want, But Do

You Sometimes Get What You Need? The German Presidency of the EU in 2007

Abstracts for all four new SEI Working Papers are included in this issue of *Euroscope* on page 8.



SEI Welcomed back Visiting Academic Fellow Prof John McCormick (from Indiana University), this summer. During his month long visit John taught on environmental politics at the summer school.

July 12-13 Jim Rollo attended a conference in memory of James Meade Economics Nobel Laureate at the Bank of England.

SEI sends its congratulations to SEI doctoral student John Fitzgibbon for securing a +3 scholarship in this year's ESRC Research Studentship Competition.

Congratulations also go to SEI doctoral student Chorng-yau Lin for completing and successfully defending his doctoral thesis on 'The Blair Initiative' and the Development of ESDI/ESDP: Continuity and Change in British post-Cold War Foreign Policy towards European Security and Defence Cooperation, 1989-2000'.

Mark Bennister's article 'Tony Blair and John Howard: Comparative Predomi-

nance and 'Institution Stretch' in the UK and Australia' was published in *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations* in August.

In August PolCES appointed Dr Gemma Loomes as Lecturer in Politics. A profile of Gemma who was previously at Keele University can be found on page 8.

September Conferences

SEI DPhil students Maria Cheiladaki-Liarokapi, Zerrin Torun, Elias Antoniou and Dora Klountzou presented papers at the UACES Annual Conference titled *Exchanging Ideas on Europe: Common Values - External Policies* at the University of Portsmouth (3-5 September). Zerrin, Elias and Dora were part of a panel chaired by Adrian Treacher on 'The EU As a Global Actor: Analysing Out-Of-Area Missions'.

Dan Hough's co-authored book with Michael Koss and Jonathan Olsen titled 'The Left Party in Contemporary German Politics' was pub-



lished by Palgrave MacMillan in September. This is the first book in either English or German to analyse the development of Germany's newest political party, the Left Party.

Francis McGowan presented his paper 'Resolving the EU's energy supply dilemma: is market liberalism in an age of economic nationalism the best approach?' to the conference *Security of Energy Supply in the New Europe: a Challenge for the EU's Neighbourhood Policy* Glasgow University September 19th 2007.

Paul Webb's co-edited book with Stephen White titled

SEI at 4th ECPR General Conference in Pisa

SEI was strongly represented by Faculty members and DPhil students at the Fourth European Consortium of Political Research General Conference in Pisa (6-8 September). Monika Bil and Aleks Szczerbiak review the conference on page 24. Papers presented by members of SEI included

- Simona Guerra
Domestic Proxies and European Elections in Central and Eastern Europe
- Dan Hough, Michael Koss and Tania Verge
On the Possibility of red-red coalitions: The Cases of Germany and Spain
- Gemma Loomes
The impact of behavioural and institutional Strategies on the fates of Western European established parties
- Emanuele Massetti
The institutionalisation of sub-state party systems in Scotland and Wales
- Francis McGowan
Fostering renewable energy- do parties make a difference?
- Aleks Szczerbiak and Monika Bil
The impact of the EU on party politics in Poland
- Aleks Szczerbiak
Roundtable: *What has happened to the quality of democracy in Europe?*
- Paul Webb
Two-party systems and political representation

The papers can be obtained from

<http://www.ecpr.visionmd.co.uk/sections.asp>

Party Politics in New Democracies was published by Oxford University Press in September (ISBN-13: 978-0-19-928965-3). See the Summer 2007 Issue of *Euroscope* for more details.

Tim Bale begins a Leverhulme Trust research fellowship in September. The award was given for the project 'The Conservative Party from Thatcher to Cameron' and will run until

June.

Mark Bennister and Tim Bale attended the Political Studies Association's, specialist group on Elections, Public Opinion and Parties annual conference in Bristol, 7-9 September. Mark Presented the paper 'Interpreting Prime Ministerial Leadership: Defining Predominance' and was a discussant on the Political Leadership Panel. Tim chaired the Con-

servative Party Panel.

Aleks Szczerbiak gave a presentation on 'Will the autumn elections in Poland result in real change and political stability?' at a briefing seminar for Ric Todd, the UK's Ambassador-Designate to Warsaw on 18 September in the Foreign and Commonwealth Office. Alan Mayhew and SEI Visiting Fellow Nat Copsey also participated in this seminar.

Forthcoming

In October SEI doctoral student Emanuele Massetti begins a three month visit to the European University Institute in Florence. Throughout the autumn term Emanuele will be conducting his research under the supervision of Prof. Michael Keating. He will use the time in Italy to research documents in the party archives of the Northern League and the South Tyrolean People's Party and to conduct interviews with party members.

SEI is co-sponsoring a round table on the Polish elections on October 21st - details can be found at:

<http://www.ceelbas.ac.uk/ceelbas-news/events/seminars/polishelections>

The Sussex European Institute and the European Research Institute of the University of Birmingham are co-organising a conference on Poland's first three years of EU membership, which will take place on 16 and 17 November 2007 at the Polish Embassy in London. Details of the conference can be found on page 21.

New Appointment

We are delighted to welcome Gemma Loomes who joins us in October as a new Lecturer in Politics and Contemporary European Studies from Keele University where she is completing her ERSC-funded PhD in the School of Politics, International Relations & Philosophy.

Gemma's research interests focus on political parties and party systems, particularly on developing party-centred interpretations of party system change. Many interpretations of party system change focus on social and electoral changes as the principal causes, yet this underplays the role that political parties can play in influencing their own fate. Parties should be considered as independent actors in the process of party system change, and her research explores the ways in which parties demonstrate this agency. Her doctoral thesis focused on these issues, and examined the engagement in strategies of political parties in seventeen western European countries between 1950 and 2006, and examined the impact of these strategies.

The thesis found that the levels of engagement in strategies were lower than expected, and that in many cases, parties engaged in behaviours that at first glance appear to be sub-optimal. However, where parties had engaged in high levels of strategies, they had a significant impact on the success that parties achieved within their national party systems. The thesis therefore found evidence in support of the argument that political parties can control their own fate, as parties' systemic positions were strongly influenced by the strategies engaged in.



Gemma Loomes

Her future research will focus on expanding upon the ideas developed in her doctoral thesis. She would particularly like to focus on party strategies in newly democratised na-

tions, as Portugal, Spain and Greece. These cases provide interesting data concerning the role of political parties in the democratisation process. The role of political parties in developing and consolidating party systems, and the optimal strategies for political parties to engage in during this process, are topics of particular interest. Additionally, the historical and institutional contexts in which political parties must operate can be a significant influence restricting or permitting certain behaviours by political parties, and she would like to explore these issues in more detail in her future research.

SEI Working Papers in Contemporary European Studies

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 94
Explaining the Success of Centre-Right Parties in Post-Communist East Central Europe: A Comparative Analysis

Seán Hanley, Aleks Szczerbiak, Tim Haughton and Brigid Fowler

s.hanley@ssees.ac.uk

A.ASzczerbiak@sussex.ac.uk

brigidfowler@yahoo.co.uk

T.J.Haughton@bham.ac.uk

Abstract

This paper attempts to explain varying patterns of centre-right success in three post-

communist states, Hungary, Poland and the Czech Republic. Success is understood as the ability to construct broad and durable parties. Macro-institutional explanations that focus on executive structures and electoral system design have limited explanatory power and it is often difficult to



Prof Aleks Szczerbiak

separate out analytically the processes of cause and effect. Although historical-structural explanations that focus on regime legacies can explain the ideological positioning of different centre-right formations in our three cases, they do little to explain their relative success.

The application of a path dependent/critical junctures framework that stresses the role of political crafting and choices made in the immediate post-transition period and the aftermath of defeat by communist successor parties in the Hungarian and Polish cases adds some insight, but there is some doubt as to whether the success in founding broad centre-right party-type formations in these periods 'locks in' through self-reinforcing mechanisms and a logic of 'increasing returns'. Other explanations that stress the importance of elite characteristics and capacity are needed to supplement the shortcomings of these approaches, in particular: (a) the presence of cohesive elites able to act as the nucleus of new centre-right formations; and (b) the ability of such elites to craft broad integrative ideological narratives that can transcend diverse ideological positions and unite broad swathes of centre-right and right-wing activists and voters.

- SEI Working Paper No 95
Territory and Electoral Politics in Germany

Dan Hough
Michael Koß
Sussex European Institute

d.t.hough@sussex.ac.uk
michael.koss@yahoo.de

Abstract

This paper analyses the effect of territory on electoral outcomes in Germany. We analyse variations in these outcomes on the basis of differential voting patterns in state-wide and sub-state elections. We illustrate that the East/West divide is by no means the complete story in terms of the influence of territory on German party political competition. To measure differentiation across space in state-wide elections we employ the Pedersen Index and a standardised coefficient of variation.

To analyse differentiation in each of Germany's 16 Länder we build on ideas of multi-level voting by introducing analysis based on the weighted mean deviations of party performance and expected vote shares in different electoral contests. Taken together, these measures give a strong indication that the differences in party performance across space in state-wide elections are also supplemented by differences in electoral outcomes across a vertical dimension; in other words, territorial distinctiveness has contributed to producing not just differing electoral results in state-wide elections across all Germany, but also in Land elections, where voters can and do differentiate between parties based on their position in sub-state party systems.

- SEI Working Paper No 96
Committee Governance in the Financial Sector in the European Union

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

Abstract

This paper examines the working of the 'Lamfalussy committees' in the banking and the securities sectors, asking whether these

are 'technical' committees or 'parapolitical' ones. These committees are composed of *experts* (national civil servants) discussing regulatory and supervisory issues in a traditionally *technical* policy area – financial services. However, the issues discussed have *political* salience. It is argued that these committees of experts tend to be argument-based (level 2) and evidence-based (level 3), even though politics, as opposed to expertise, enter the policy process under specific circumstances.

- SEI Working Paper No 97

You Can't Always Get What You Want, But Do You Sometimes Get What You Need? The German Presidency of the EU in 2007

Lucia Quaglia, Dan Hough and Alan Mayhew

Sussex European Institute

L.Quaglia@sussex.ac.uk

d.t.hough@sussex.ac.uk

a.mayhew@sussex.ac.uk

Abstract

The paper contributes to the ongoing debate as to whether large member states make better (or worse) presidents of the European Union and if this is indeed so, then why? It focuses on the German presidency of 2007, comparing and contrasting the German performance with sets of ideal-typical characteristics.



Professor Alan Mayhew

The argument is developed in three main stages. Firstly, drawing on the academic literature on EU presidencies, we outline four key roles that are traditionally performed by the presidency. These are that of business manager; mediator; political leader and internal/external representa-

tive. Secondly, these roles are applied to the empirical record as criteria to devise a score-card of the presidency under consideration (in this case the German one). Empirically, the paper will look at the negotiations that underpinned attempts to revise the Constitutional Treaty, EU economic, energy and environmental policy, relations with Russia and finally neighbourhood policy. The paper argues that the German presidency performed rather well, particularly in terms of the traditional 'communitarian' criteria, as well as when measured against the presidency's own pre-stated priorities and more long-term national aims.

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')

e-mail: sei@sussex.ac.uk

European Parties Elections & Referendums Network (EPERN): Election Briefings

The network produces an ongoing series of briefings on the impact of European integration on election campaigns. There are three new additions to the election briefing paper series and a further two forthcoming papers. 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 32
EUROPE AND THE FINNISH PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS OF MARCH 2007

Tapio Raunio
University of Tampere
tapio.raunio@uta.fi

Key points:

- The election produced a major victory for the centre-right parties, with the conservative National Coalition achieving a particularly good result winning 22.3% of the vote and 50 seats.
- The leading government party, the Centre, maintained its position as the largest party, with 51 seats and 23.1 % of the vote.
- The combined vote share of the left-wing parties declined, with the Social Democrats receiving a major blow by finishing third behind the two centre-right parties.
- The populist True Finns, the only Eurosceptical party represented in the Eduskunta, more than doubled their vote share from the 2003 elections.
- Turnout fell to 67.9%, the lowest figure since the Second World War.
- The new government will be a coalition between three centre-right parties - the Centre, the National Coalition and the Swedish People's Party - and the Green League. The new government will continue its predecessor's pro-EU policies.

- ELECTION BRIEFING No.33

THE FRENCH PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION OF 22 APRIL AND 6 MAY 2007

Dr. Sally Marthaler
Sussex European Institute
University of Sussex
s.a.marthaler@sussex.ac.uk

SEI RESEARCH IN PROGRESS SEMINARS

AUTUMN TERM 2007

Tuesdays 14.15 - 15.50

Except in week 8 on Wednesday 21.11.07

Arts C233

9 October

Reforming the EU budget: Frequently asked questions, rarely given answers

Dr Jaroslaw Pietras, University of Warsaw

16 October

Roundtable on 'European Neighbourhood Policy'

Dr Nat Copsey, University of Birmingham

Dr Christophe Hillion, University of Leiden

Prof Alan Mayhew, University of Sussex

23 October

National Preference Formation in the New EU Member States: Drawing Lessons from the Czech and Slovak Republics

Dr Tim Haughton, University of Birmingham

30 October

Financial Services Governance in the EU

Lucia Quaglia, University of Sussex

6 November**

The external dimension of EU migration policy

Dr Emma Haddad, European Commission

13 November*

Populism in Poland

Dr Jacek Kucharczyk, Institute of Public Affairs

21 November*

The changing contours of business power

Prof Michael Moran, University of Manchester

27 November*

SEI roundtable on the 'France under Sarkozy: the first six months'

Dr Sally Marthaler, Prof Alan Mayhew, Prof Jim Rollo, University of Sussex

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

*Joint with Politics

**Joint with Politics and the Sussex Centre for Migration Research

EPERN

European Parties Elections
and Referendums Network

Key Points

- Sarkozy won 31.2% of the first-round ballot, the highest vote for a centre-right candidate since Giscard d'Estaing polled 32.6% in 1974.
- The defeat of Ségolène Royal was the third consecutive defeat for a Socialist Party presidential candidate.
- The centrist François Bayrou presented a serious challenge to the two other mainstream contenders.
- There was a revival of support for the mainstream parties and a commensurate decline in support for the minor or anti-system parties.
- The first round turnout of 83.8% was the highest in any French presidential election since 1974.
- Twelve candidates ran for the presidency.

- ELECTION BRIEFING No.34

THE FRENCH LEGISLATIVE
ELECTIONS
OF 10 AND 17 JUNE 2007

Dr. Sally Marthaler
Sussex European Institute
University of Sussex
s.a.marthaler@sussex.ac.uk

Key Points

- Sarkozy's centre-right Union for a Popular Movement (UMP) did not win the predicted landslide but retained an absolute majority in the National Assembly.
- For the first time since 1978, an incumbent party was returned to government.
- Turnout in both rounds was the lowest ever recorded in French legislative elections at 60%.
- The Socialists did better than expected

but the party remains divided and its leadership is contested.

- The elections confirmed the trend towards greater bipolarisation and the dominance of the Union for a Popular Movement and the Socialist Party.
- There was a re-configuration of the centre ground with two new formations but Bayrou's Democratic Movement made little impact.
- The decline of the smaller parties continued.



**Dr Sally
Marthaler**

Two Forthcoming Papers in September

- ELECTION BRIEFING NO 35
EUROPE AND THE GENERAL
ELECTION IN THE REPUBLIC
OF IRELAND, MAY 24 2007

Dr Michael Holmes
Department of Politics, Liverpool
Hope University
holmesm@hope.ac.uk

Key points

- The outgoing Fianna Fáil-Progressive Democrats coalition lost seats, while Fine Gael made the biggest gains in the election.
- However, Fianna Fáil's Bertie Ahern was returned as Prime Minister (Taoiseach) for the third time.
- For the first time, the Green Party was included in government as part of a three-party Fianna Fáil-Progressive Democrats-Green Party coalition.
- The European Union did not feature at all in the campaign, apart from a short-lived attempt to raise tax harmonisation as an

issue.

- ELECTION BRIEFING
NO 36
GENERAL ELECTIONS IN
TURKEY OF 22 JULY 2007

Zerrin Torun
Sussex European Institute
University of Sussex
Z.Torun@sussex.ac.uk

Key Points

- The ruling conservative Justice and Development Party won a landslide election victory extending its share of vote to 46.58%.
- The main opposition, centre-left, fiercely secularist Republican People's Party suffered a major defeat, as its share of votes increased just by 0.49%, despite the electoral coalition with a smaller party.
- The right wing, extreme nationalist, Nationalist Action Party has achieved a revival of support and became the third largest party in the Parliament.
- 26 independent candidates, most of which were supported informally by the Democratic Society Party made it to the parliament.
- Both the ruling Justice and Development Party and opposition parties framed the elections as a decision on the characteristics of the state, such as democracy or authoritarianism, secularism or Islamism, nationalism or dependency.
- EU questions were not as salient as one would have expected which may be due to the perceived tardiness of the EU on Turkish accession.



Zerrin Torun

POLITICS RESEARCH IN PROGRESS SEMINARS SERIES (& THE CENTRE FOR PARTIES & DEMOCRACY IN EUROPE & SEI)

Autumn 2007

Wednesdays 2-4pm in C233

*** Held jointly with SEI; Tuesdays at 14.15-15.50**

10 October

Political Marketing in Britain and Germany
Kim Jucknat (International University, Bruchsal, and Sussex)

24 October

Centre Parties and Party Competition in the UK since 1945
Jack Nagel (Penn State)

6 November*

The external dimension of EU migration policy
Emma Haddad (European Commission)

13 November*

Populism in Poland
Jack Kucharczyk (Institute of Public Affairs)

14 November

Domestic proxies and the European factor before and after accession: Polish attitudes toward European integration in comparative perspective
Simona Guerra (University of Sussex)

21 November*

The changing contours of business power
Mick Moran (Manchester)

27 November*

Roundtable on 'France under Sarkozy: The First Six Months'
Sally Marthaler, Alan Mayhew, Jim Rollo (Sussex)

5 December

Community governance
Sarah Hale (Birkbeck)

** Jointly with SEI (TUESDAYS 2.15-3.50 C233, except for Moran on 21/11)*

The Reform Treaty – the Constitution re-packaged or a new start?

Alan Mayhew

The agreement reached in Brussels in June to adopt amendments to the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty establishing the European Community was a triumph for the German Presidency of the European Union (see SEI Working Paper Nr. 97 by Quaglia, Hough and Mayhew

http://www.sussex.ac.uk/sei/documents/working_paper_97.pdf).

Is it however also a triumph for the European Union, which after all set out to agree a new Constitutional Treaty, which as Giscard d'Estaing famously said would govern the development of the Union for the next fifty years? Amendments to the EU treaties are after all rather low key when compared to a new Constitution!

However one possible explanation is that the two are in fact the same; only the language and symbols separate the amending treaty from the draft Constitution. Indeed this is what Eurosceptics in the United Kingdom are saying. They frequently quote as evidence to support their opinions the statements of leaders of other more integrationist states, who are reassuring their citizens that the two documents are essentially the same.

The first detailed legal analyses comparing the two documents are just beginning to appear at the time of writing (Professor Stephen Peers from Essex University on Statewatch for instance - <http://www.statewatch.org/news/2007/aug/eu-reform-treaty-texts-analyses.htm>). These will give us a clearer picture of the real situation, though we must really wait for the final version at the end of the IGC.

It should be remembered however that the original text of the Constitutional Treaty, signed by all Governments and ratified by 18 of them, was already a watered down version of the draft treaty which was produced by the Constitutional Convention. Indeed

the presence of many Government representatives in the Convention itself had already led to frustration amongst the more enthusiastic integrationists. And the Constitutional Convention had been presided over by Giscard, not reputed to be someone who would be keen to give up national sovereignty. And he was ably assisted by John Kerr, the former British Permanent Representative!

The idea that there was any risk of the new Treaty transferring power on a significant scale to the Union is therefore not really credible.

While for political reasons, at least in the United Kingdom, the Reform Treaty is being compared to the Constitutional Treaty, it is of more significance to look at the changes the Reform Treaty implies to the existing treaty base. The changes can be divided into competence, institutional matters and policy reforms.

One main aim of the Convention which drew up the first draft of the Constitutional Treaty was to clarify the competence of the Union and of the Member States. The Reform Treaty will help to clarify who does what, though some of the simplicity of the Constitutional Treaty has been lost in the negotiations. The National Parliaments will now have a more important role in assessing whether the Commission is respecting the principle of subsidiarity and the division of competences.

The institutional and legal changes have drawn most attention. The Union will have legal personality, which will allow the EU to act on the international stage and especially in international institutions.

This vital change has been somewhat overshadowed by media attention on more politically interesting matters. When ratified, the Reform Treaty will create two important new posts at the top of the Union's hierarchy.



Professor Alan Mayhew

The President of the European Council will be elected by a qualified majority of the Member States

and will chair the European Council for two and a half years with a possibility of one renewal. As chair, he/she will be responsible for ensuring that its work programme is implemented. The essential role is to ensure continuity and to foster consensus.

The High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy is appointed by the European Council but the choice must be agreed with the President of the Commission. He/she will preside on the Foreign Affairs Council and be responsible to the Council for the conduct of the Union's Common Foreign and Security Policy but will also be Vice President of the Commission charged with external relations.

Both of these two new posts are aimed at giving more consistency and continuity to the action of the Union. Much will depend on who will fill these posts but there is clearly plenty of room for disharmony and strife. So while the aim is to enhance efficiency, the opposite is not excluded.

The other main institutional changes are also aimed at achieving more efficiency, through limiting the size of the Union's institutions, reinforcing the power of the President of the Commission and simplifying the voting system in the Council. On this latter point, the European Council decided on a fairly straightforward double majority voting system but owing to opposition from the Polish Government this will not become fully operational until 2017! And what was meant to be a simplification has become an example of bureaucratic complexity.

The size of the Commission may still be a point of animated debate because the Re-

form Treaty reduces the size of the Commission to two-thirds of the number of member states (at present 18). The idea that nine countries would not have 'their Commissioner' may well persuade the Council to decide to change this rule, as the Reform Treaty allows.

On policy, the Reform Treaty represents a certain retreat in foreign policy from the proposals of the Constitutional Treaty but nevertheless improves, at least in efficiency terms, on the existing treaties. On Justice, Freedom and Security progress has been made with the incorporation of elements of the Prüm Treaty into the Reform Treaty. Most of the other small changes to policy proposed by the Constitutional Treaty will survive in the new 'Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union'.

The United Kingdom negotiated an 'opt out' from another key change, the Charter of Fundamental Rights, which now has equivalent value to that of the Treaties. While the value of this opt out is being questioned, it is interesting to note that the UK now has so many opt-outs and opt-ins that it is progressively becoming marginalised. What was also evident at the June summit was that the other 26 member states no longer care about it!

Is the Reform Treaty a Constitution? I am not sure that this question would make much sense in any other member state than the UK. But this is no Constitution! It is a treaty which may slightly improve the efficiency of policy-making and to some extent clarifies the role of the Union. A Constitution would be a very different document!

Alan Mayhew is currently advising the Government of Ukraine on the negotiation of a new enhanced agreement with the EU. This agreement should take over from the Partnership and Cooperation Agreement when this comes up for renewal in 2008 and is conditional on Ukraine joining the WTO.

SEI Student Reports

Students from MACES, MAEP and DPhil programmes reflect on their experiences of SEI over the last year.

SEI Brussels Trip Report

Mette Damsbo (MACES 2006-7)

We arrived at the hostel in Brussels on Monday afternoon. Most of the group travelled by coach and the journey went smoothly, except for something about a wing mirror and the Channel Tunnel! The first day we didn't have anything planned so the rest of the day was spent exploring Brussels – getting slightly lost, and some of the group discovered the table tennis table at the hostel which was to become great evening entertainment!

We had all been looking forward to the trip and the arranged programme. Whether it was your first visit to Brussels or not. The entire group was excited about visiting the “city at the centre of Europe” especially equipped with the knowledge we had gained from the last 8 months at SEI.

The first day of our scheduled programme took us to Guy Milton from the Council Secretariat. He talked about the Constitution and the reflection period in which the EU found itself in at the time. After time for questions and photos, we visited the Emilia Romagna office, where we met Leonardo Piccinetti, (SEI alumni). There we had two interesting talks about lobbying the EU and regional networks in Europe.

After more questions, and cups of coffee we skipped lunch (due to all the questions we were now running late!) and rushed to the European Parliament. After seeing the hemicycle and learning about the process of applying to work for EU-institutions, Michael

Shackleton gave a talk. We then had a quick bite to eat before we visited two SEI alumni who talked about their experience at Sussex University and the opportunities presenting themselves after they finished their MA. Afterwards, the group went for the alumni drinks evening.

The first visit on Wednesday morning was to the UK Representation. We found the speakers very interesting and relevant as they covered quite a wide range of topics such as EMU, the budget, enlargement, and for me personally it was highly interesting to hear Phil Douglas (FSJ) and Emma Haddad (Home Office) talk about immigration and asylum policies. In the afternoon we visited DG Regio where Jürgen Grunwald from the Commission's legal service gave a very thorough talk. I think we all appreciated the effort he went to by *literally* drawing us a picture of the workings of common law within EU Member States! Graham Meadows (former director of DG Regio) was next and he was an extremely entertaining speaker, who shared many funny stories with us while talking about the importance of EU cohesion policy and regional development.

On Thursday we were all up early to catch a bus to SHAPE outside of Brussels. A captain with a cold greeted us, but he managed nonetheless to make it through the presentation talk and slides which attempted to give us an overview of the workings of SHAPE and the challenges NATO faces. After a break with coffee (and for some of us, huge chocolate desserts and cakes!) we had the opportunity to ask questions to a panel - who although working for NATO at SHAPE, would not agree to the fact that they represented NATO, which at times made the Q & A session seem slightly bizarre. They seemed to be quite taken aback with some of the questions the group put to them, and they adopted a very defensive position that I imagine only prompted further questions from our group.

However, I do believe we all learned something from the visit, and it was a unique chance to get to visit SHAPE. The panel session in particular highlighted, the scale of their operations and procedures - and with that, the difficulties with which NATO at times struggles. The afternoon was spent at DG Enlarg and the talks mainly focussed on the enlargement process! On our last eve-

ning we went out for a few drinks, played more table tennis, and I am sure some of us had a last waffle with ice cream before having to pack, and head back to Brighton the following day.

We left on the Friday – after a last minute visa collection, and I think I can speak for everyone on the trip when I say that we had an eventful and interesting week with a well-planned and very relevant programme, as well as good times spent in each other's company.

'A year at SEI'

Daniel Azzopardi (with Andrea Covic (MACES 2006-7))

My last undergraduate exams were over; the beaches of Malta were packed as the mercury was hitting 38 celsius. However, no summer vibe could compare to the excitement I experienced when I received a call from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs saying that I had been awarded a masters scholarship at SEI. And there I was, three months later, at the Malta international airport at 7:30am, waiting to board my flight after an emotional goodbye from my loved ones.

A few hours later I found myself in flat 3 of the postgraduate off-campus Kings Road residence, overlooking the windy English Channel - a scene that I will never forget.



Daniel Azzopardi

That same night, most residents of Kings Road flocked to nearby bars, which marked the beginning of great friendships, some of them with my fellow-students from the Sussex European Institute. Education and social life would gradually evolve into two elements that fused perfectly in affecting

my life in all aspects.

The preconceptions about studying at Sussex, positively fuelled by two of my undergraduate professors, were fulfilled. Both I and Andrea Covic found it rewarding to be part of such a renowned institute. Many others before

us are nowadays playing important roles in our lives as citizens of Europe due to their influence in domestic and EU level policy making.

Of course, the privilege of studying at such a high level did come with a price and many a sacrifice. The intense preparations for the January exam throughout December, the difficulty of writing term papers and focusing on academic research with people swimming a few meters away from my window, and the invitations from so many international friends while trying to write a dissertation are all intertwined in my memory together with the great feeling of having ultimately accomplished my academic goals at SEI.

Since all work and no play make Jack a dull boy, I was determined not to miss out on tasting the social life in one of Britain's top party Meccas; and through my Kings Road experience, this Jack had plenty of toys to play with! Thanks to great friendships born at SEI, fantastic trips were made to places I never imagined I could visit: Croatia, Kosovo -and, for others, Malta. A nasty syndrome accompanied the return from all these trips: adapting back from a hot climate to the British rain, which, similarly to my Mediterranean colleagues, I never managed to successfully do.

In conclusion, I tend to define the period between September 06 and September 07 as a roller-coaster ride, which involved some heavy G's to absorb; yet still offering the enjoyment of a pleasant ride. SEI has given me the priceless gift of enriching me both academically and culturally, both of these aspects of my Sussex life I will always remember with nostalgia and gratitude.



Andrea Covic

‘Exploring and enjoying studying in the UK!’

Blerim Vela, (MAEP 2006-7)

Since October 2006, I have been enrolled at the University of Sussex (US) on the MA on European Politics programme. My decision to study at SEI was based on my prior research of the MA programme and my aim to find a MA programme that combines the theoretical with practical aspects of politics.

A year later I can say that nearly all my expectations have been met. Certainly there are some highlights of the past year. On the one hand, I can say that I am satisfied with academic staff and their engagement. I had the chance to attend the classes of practitioners that were extremely relevant to my perspectives and long-term priorities of my country. On the other hand, throughout the year I had the opportunity to review the most up to date and relevant literature.

I believe that the MA programme has provided me with the necessary theoretical framework, as well as the critical eye based on the practice. The achievement of my career goals have been further facilitated by the knowledge gained during my studies at University of Sussex. Certainly in five years time, I hope to start my PhD studies in a UK. Living in UK for almost a year was a unique experience for me. It was the first time that I had to live for a period of time away from my family and friends, whilst at same time live with five other wonderful flat mates. I was faced with the day-to-day challenges of life and at the same time plan the academic and social life.



Blerim Vela

During this time, I met with people from different countries and came to understand and appreciate diverse cultures. I was impressed with the orderly functioning of British society and services. It provided me with sense of security and stability as there were procedures for everything!

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 during the summer term. Lyubka Savkova reviews the conference held by SEI to analyse Bulgaria’s accession to the EU. Jim Rollo reports on the conference held July 16-17 to mark the 50th Anniversary of the Treaty of Rome, 20th Anniversary of the Cecchini Report and the 15th Anniversary of Sussex European Institute. Maria Cheiladaki and Theodora Klountzou review the UACES Annual Conference held in September. Details are also provided of the forthcoming conference on ‘Poland and the EU’.

‘The Successful Laggard: Opportunities and Challenges from Bulgaria’s Membership to the European Union’

Lyubka Savkova

The topic of Bulgaria’s accession to the European Union which took place on the 1st January 2007 has been in the spotlight of academic debates with various conferences, workshops and roundtables organised recently around the UK at the universities of Salford, London School of Economics, Birmingham and UCL as well as the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the Bulgarian and Romanian embassies and the Bulgarian City Club. On the 11th of May 2007 Sussex European Institute hosted its own conference to mark Bulgaria’s accession to the EU entitled “*The Successful Laggard: Opportunities and Challenges from Bulgaria’s Membership to the European Union*”. The event was extremely successful and brought together academics from ten European universities, the European parliament, the European Commission, Bulgarian diplomats, journalists and policy experts with interests in European affairs.



Bulgarian Ambassador to the UK Dr Luchezar Matev and Lyubka Savkova

The day began with a welcome address by Professor Aleks Szczerbiak who in his capacity of a Co-director of the Sussex European Institute reflected upon the institute's leading role in disseminating top quality research on contemporary European issues and developments to which this conference was a fitting example. His opening remarks were followed by contributions from the first panel of experts on Bulgaria who explored the opportunities arising from the country's membership from three very different perspectives. Julian Popov (*Bulgarian School of Politics*) raised the controversial issue of Bulgaria's role as a member state and its position on the question of Turkish membership influenced by Bulgaria's ethnically heterogeneous population and the permanent presence of a Turkish minority party in parliament.

The second speaker Dr. Milena Borden (*University of Reading*) discussed the historical construction of Bulgarian national identity and its dividing and conjoining lines with European identity. This naturally swayed the debate to the role and responsibilities of Bulgaria's political elite in popularising the European Union at home before and after accession. Dr. Maria Spirova (*University of Leiden*) discussed this theme in light of the process of Europeanization of the Bulgarian party system and the recent rise of populism in Bulgaria.

The Bulgarian Ambassador to the UK H. E. Dr. Luchezar Matev gave a keynote speech at the conference outlining the political, economic, social and cultural benefits of Bulgaria's accession for Britain and Europe as a

whole. He emphasized Bulgaria's highly educated workforce, the continuous rise of foreign investment in the country, efforts to curb corruption at the high echelons of power and Bulgaria's tolerant attitude towards ethnic minorities which is exceptional on the Balkans.

The second half of the conference focused on the challenges for Bulgaria from membership. Kalin Ivanov (*University of Oxford*) presented a paper on the politics of corruption in Bulgaria discussing the efforts of Bulgaria's institutions and their limitations in the fight with corruption which remains the most criticised area of Bulgaria's accession. Craig Otter (*Economist Intelligence Unit*) looked at the state of Bulgaria's economy and the problems of depopulation and migration. The final contribution to the conference by Helewise Elfferich from the European Commission addressed the Commission's post-accession monitoring of Bulgaria and the implications this may have for future enlargements. Full length reports on the conference can be found in June issues of the following Bulgarian and British newspapers: Sofia Echo, Sunday Times, Sunny.

UACES Annual Conference 2007: 'Exchanging Ideas on Europe: Common Values - External Policies'

Maria Cheiladaki-Liarokapi & Theodora Klountzou

This year, the UACES Annual Conference was hosted by the recently established Centre for European and International Studies Research of the University of Portsmouth, situated at the heart of the historic city of Portsmouth (3-5 September). The 2007 UACES conference entitled 'Exchanging Ideas on Europe: Common Values - External Policies' had a special focus on the relations between the EU and Africa and the relation-



Maria Cheiladaki-Liarokapi

ship between human rights and religion. The JCMS Annual Review Lecture adopted as its special focus the politics of legal integration in the EU. The evening before the opening of the conference, an informal meeting had been scheduled at the Old Customs House, a real-English pub situated at

the historic administrative building for the naval base at Gunwharf Quays. The first day opened with a walking tour at Portsmouth Harbour including the astonishing Spinnaker Tower.

The first plenary session on EU and Africa also took place during the first day. The session was chaired by Prof. Anthony Chafer of the University of Portsmouth and invited speakers included Prof. Peter Katjavivi, ambassador of the Embassy of the Republic of Namibia in Germany, and Dr. Gorm Rye Olsen of the University of Roskilde. The second plenary session on Human Rights and Religion took place at the second day of the conference. It was chaired by Prof. Ulrike Liebert of the University of Bremen and invited speakers included Prof. Richard Bellamy of the University College London and Prof. Tariq Ramadan of the University of Oxford. The same day, Dr. Lisa Conant of the University of Denver and author of the book *Justice Contained: Law and Politics in the European Union* (Cornell University Press) addressed the JCMS Annual Review Lecture. Dr. Conant argued that EU political scientists would benefit from looking at how their counterparts have analysed the role of the courts in domestic policy-processes in their effort to better conceptualise the role of the ECJ in the EU policy-process.

The second day closed with a reception and a conference dinner on board the HMS Warrior, one of most significant historic warships in the world. The conference dinner also included an Award Ceremony. Prof. William Paterson was awarded the Lifetime Achievement Award while the 2007 UACES prize for the best book went to two books this year: Andrew Jordan and Adriaan Schout's book *The Coordination of the European Union: Exploring the Capacities of Networked Governance* (Oxford University Press) and Lynn

Dobson's book *Supranational Citizenship* (Manchester University Press). The UACES prize for best PhD thesis went to Thomas Larue of Umeå University in Sweden for his thesis *Agents in Brussels: Delegations and Democracy in the European Union*.

As with every year, the UACES conference offered a unique opportunity to research students and academics to present their work and to discuss their ideas with other colleagues working in the same area. Overall, 7 research sessions and 54 panels were formed and more than 160 presenters participated in the conference.

The conference covered a wide range of topics in EU research including a research panel on Research Agendas and Interdisciplinarity. As with every year, the University of Sussex had a strong representation from PhD students and academics. In this years' conference Maria Cheiladaki-Liarokapi presented a synopsis of her PhD thesis in a paper entitled 'Comparing the Influence of Supranational Institutions in the Policy-Making Processes of Student and Patient Mobility'. Emanuele Massetti presented a paper entitled 'Taking a Stance on Europe: Minority Nationalist Parties in Britain between Ideology and Pragmatism'. Finally, Anna Sydorak focused on transatlantic antitrust cooperation in a paper entitled 'European Cooperation in Competition Policy: Efficiency and Public Interest vs. Bureaucratic Politics in Transatlantic Relations'.

The University of Sussex also demonstrated its team spirit by forming a panel entitled 'The EU as a Global Actor: Analysing Out-Of-Area Missions' which was chaired by Dr. Adrian Treacher. Presenters were Theodora Klountzou who presented a paper on 'Europeanisation and the Export of European Values through ESDP: The Case of FYROM'; Elias Antoniou with a paper entitled 'Confronting Institutional Challenges in EU Foreign Policymaking: The Case of the African Peace Facility' and Zerrin Torun who focused on operation Artemis in a paper entitled 'Operation Artemis and Beyond: Dynamics behind ESDP Activism in Africa'. Finally,



Theodora Klountzou

Dr. Peter Holmes acted as a chair in a panel entitled 'Trade, Competition and Industrial Policy: The International Dimension' and the Co-Director of Sussex European Institute, with Prof. Jim Rollo, as a participant.

POLAND AND THE EU: EVALUATING THE FIRST THREE YEARS OF MEMBERSHIP

November 16th/17th
Venue: Polish Embassy, London

The Sussex European Institute and the European Research Institute of the University of Birmingham are co-organising a conference on Poland's first three years of EU membership, which will take place on 16 and 17 November 2007 at the Polish Embassy in London.

Over the past three years, the Polish government's European policy has been a source of considerable controversy and has been widely criticised. This conference on Poland in the EU will take place three weeks after this autumn's pre-term parliamentary elections in Poland and provides the opportunity not only for an expert assessment of the initial phase of membership, but also the chance to look forward to the European policy of the next government. We are extremely grateful to our co-sponsors the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, the Polish Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Centre for East European Language-Based Studies (CEELBAS) and the Sussex European Institute without whose support this event would not be possible. The programme for the conference is below. If you would like to attend, please email Dr Nathaniel Copsey at n.copsey@bham.ac.uk to register. For more information visit <http://www.sussex.ac.uk/sei/>

DAY 1: Friday November 16th

11am Opening address

Ambassador HE Ms Barbara Tuge-Erecińska
Chair: Prof George Kolankiewicz (School of Slavonic and East European Studies/UCL)

11.30am-1pm Session 1 (Politics: Public Opinion, Parties and Electoral Politics)

Why do Poles love the EU but vote for Eurosceptic parties?

Prof Aleks Szczerbiak (Sussex European Institute)

The Europeanization of Polish parties

Jacek Kucharczyk (Instytut Spraw Publicznych)

Ask the people: Focus group research on Polish attitudes towards the EU

Simona Guerra (Sussex European Institute)

2.15pm-3.45pm Session 2 (Politics: Institutional adaptation/Governance)

A 2007 survey of the EU policy co-ordination system in Poland: Findings and conclusions

Dr Artur Nowak-Far (Warsaw School of Economics)

Recent developments in Poland's EU policy co-ordination: comparing the pre- and post-accession periods

Jowanka Jakubek (University of Warsaw)

The scrutiny of EU legislation by the Polish parliament

Leszek Kieniewicz (Senate International and EU Committee)

4.15pm-5.30pm Session 3 (Economy: Macro-economic impacts)

Macro-economic policy performance since accession

Dr Pawel Samecki (National Bank of Poland)

Will the Last Electrician Turn Off the Light Before Leaving: Polish Labour Markets in the EU Perspective

Dr Tomasz Mickiewicz (School of Slavonic and East European Studies/UCL)

Foreign Direct Investment and the internationalisation of Polish business

Prof Alan Mayhew (Sussex European Institute)

DAY 2 Saturday November 17th

9.30am-11.00am Session 4 (Economy: Sectoral developments)

Polish agriculture and the EU

Waldemar Guba (Ministry of Agriculture)

Absorption of EU funds

Tomasz Nowakowski (Office of the Committee for European Integration)

Poland and the Lisbon Agenda

Piotr Serafin (Office of the Committee for European Integration)

11.15am-12.45pm Session 5 (Poland's impact in EU institutions)

The EP after enlargement: Polish MEPs and their impact on the political life of the chamber

Melchior Szczepanik (Loughborough University)

The Europeanisation of Polish diplomacy and diplomats in the Council of Ministers

Karolina Pomorska (University of Maastricht)

2.00-2.30pm Keynote address

Three years of Polish membership in the EU - a step to reunify Europe?

Dr Marek Cichocki (Natolin Foundation)

2.30-3.15pm Session 6 (Poland's EU agenda)

Poland and the European Neighbourhood Policy

Dr Nat Copsey (University of Birmingham)

Poland and the EU Budget negotiations

Piotr Serafin (Office of the Committee for European Integration)

SEI 15th Anniversary Conference: 'What have we learned from European Economic Integration?'

Jim Rollo (SEI Co-director)

Fifty Years after the Treaty of Rome, twenty years after the Cecchini Report and fifteen years after the founding of Sussex European Institute (SEI), and in the light of ongoing work at SEI and the Centre for the Analysis of Regional Integration at Sussex (CARIS), it seemed an apposite moment to reflect on the experience of the European Union, the academic research that it has stimulated and what it means for future research. It was also a point at which to mark the departure of Alasdair Smith as Vice Chancellor from the University of Sussex. He is a major figure in the literature on economic integration and for 26 years has been a driving force in research at Sussex on economic integration. The conference has been run by SEI with the generous financial support of the British Department of Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform (BERR), which is gratefully acknowledged.

As a way to reflect on these issues, On July 16th-17th the Sussex European Institute held the Conference "What have we learned from European Economic Integration?". The intention was to have a brainstorming style of conference where presentations not papers were presented in order to encourage debate and indeed fruitful disagreement. The field was not just focused on the EU though given its role as the major exemplar of inter state deep integration it was a key subject of consideration both in itself and its influence in the world. The presentations were not simply on economics, but also from a political science perspective, policy implications, empirical and theoretical developments, etc. The follow up to this conference will be pursued in research planning that is being developed by both SEI and CARIS, and in a future conference focusing specifically on deep integration.

Helen Wallace and Francis McGowan reflected on the political economy from a political science perspective. Michael Gasiorek and Tony Venables reflected on developing

country issues in preferential integration and David Vines asked whether the current wave of Regional Integration in East Asia owed anything to the EU example; Peter Holmes and Alasdair Smith considered the lessons from EU integration for the rest of the world and modelling respectively. Jaroslav Pietras, and Alan Mayhew discussed the impact of the European integration process on policies and outcomes in the countries central Europe, Fabienne Ilzkovitz and Adriaan Dierx examined the challenges for further deep integration within the EU while Peter Dodd (standing in for Vicky Pryce) and Jim Rollo looked at the challenges for policy makers from developments in empirical techniques and theory; Alan Winters examined migration as perhaps the deepest form of deep integration.

There were lacunae; above all the conference did not look at monetary integration except in passing in the presentations by Vines and Rollo either in itself or through the controversies over its possible impact on trade and growth. Helen Wallace (founding Director of SEI) and John Palmer (SEI practitioner Fellow) discussed the longer term implications of economic and political integration in the EU over the last 50 years while Francis McGowan spoke to the political economy of EU integration of the regulation of network utilities.

50 Years of Economic Integration

The EU in its development over the last 50 years from customs union to common market and now including monetary union has been a natural experiment in economic integration. This has had important implications for the development of social science theory and analysis as well as for the understanding of practical policy making.

For political scientists and lawyers consideration of the impetus to regulatory harmonisation and the underlying project of political integration led by economic integration gave rise to a (contested) differentiation between negative integration (the removal of border barriers) and positive integration (harmonisation of regulation and laws). Interpretation of the treaty by the Court of justice and above all the Cassis de Dijon case also developed the potential for integration by introducing the principal of mutual recognition which in turn gave an incen-

tive for the reinvigoration of the integration of the internal market held up by inability to agree on common standards and regulations and eventually to the Single European Act.

For economists the analysis of the impact of completing the single market – the Cecchini Report – published in 1987 also brought a further improvement in the analytical basis for understanding economic integration and one which once more came closer to the empirical realities of economic integration in particular the partial equilibrium, imperfect competition, differentiated products, increasing-returns-to scale models associated with Smith and Venables, which proved a fertile approach to estimating the potential impact of the single market for goods.

The Cecchini Report also began the process of trying to estimate the effects of administrative and regulatory obstacles to trade notably customs procedures but also the cost of regulation assessed from case studies and surveys. The single market and the introduction of the regulation of technical barriers to trade, Sanitary and phytosanitary measures, services, intellectual property and investment into the global trade rules in the Uruguay Round brought the distinction between shallow (removing frontier barriers) and deep integration (liberalisation of regulatory barriers to trade) into more widespread use. The integration of the transition economies of central Europe in the European economy culminating in the 5th enlargement of the EU from May 2004 onwards stimulated further work on trade and economic welfare of European integration. Much of this work drew on general equilibrium modelling in the footsteps of the pioneering work by Baldwin et al (1997) but other work by Baldwin (1992) and by Mayhew (1995) took a wider view of the processes at work and considered the political economy of EU enlargement and what this might imply for sequencing of adjustment to EU norms particularly on the environment and labour markets.

The study of these effects was a key aspect of the task set for Sussex European Institute when it was set up in 1992. It took as its remit integration in the wider post-Communist Europe. The newly emerging democratic market economies had to recreate the institutional, legal and regulatory frameworks necessary for the functioning of a

modern market economy. For Central Europe that became de facto the European Union model beginning with the deep inte-

gration aspects of the Europe Agreements just coming into effect as SEI was beginning its work. Work by Rollo and Smith (1992) and Smith et al (1996) was influential on both research agendas and on policy. The deep integration agenda raised governance questions investigated by a succession of scholars under the supervision of Helen Wallace and explored in successive editions of Wallace and Wallace. More recently, SEI in cooperation with CARIS (Centre for the Analysis of Regional Integration at Sussex) and stimulated by the new impetus for the EU and the US to pursue preferential trade agreements with elements of deep integration particularly with developing countries has returned to the issue of shallow and deep integration and their economic impacts. This includes work on analytical and diagnostic frameworks to help negotiators (particularly but not only in developing countries) to assess the implications of any proposed agreement with a view to maximising benefits and minimising costs (Evans et al 1995).

This work has thrown up again the difficulty of making general statements about the impact of regulatory or deep integration to match the long established trade creation/trade diversion framework that allows us to be reasonably confident about the impact of shallow integration generated by any given agreement. It is not sufficient to treat regulation simply as a cost of doing business. It also generates outputs and in some cases internalises externalities – and often that is the precise intention. The difficulty of measuring these regulatory outputs and their potential impact on trade, productivity and investment along with the rather uncertain theoretical basis and lack of clear empirical certainties of the connections between trade and growth leaves the costs and benefits of deep integration still as an open research field. This has been the focus of a rapidly developing, exciting and innovative research agenda in SEI, CARIS and IDS.

The conference papers are available at <http://www.sussex.ac.uk/Units/caris/seiconference/seiconf.html.html>

Pisa 2007: ECPR General Conference Report

Monika Bil and Aleks Szczerbiak

The ECPR fourth biennial conference was hosted by the University of Pisa, Italy from 6-8 September 2007. With over 1600 participants coming to Pisa to discuss their research in 331 panel sessions, 10 symposiums and many other additional meetings such as standing groups and cultural events – it was twice the size of previous ECPR general conferences. The conference attracted political scientists from around the world representing all the various sub-fields and methodological approaches in the discipline.

SEI was well represented, with researchers from the Institute presenting in seven panels. The conference was opened with a roundtable attended by around 300 delegates on 'Can Some Democracies Claim to be of Higher Quality than Others?' where one of the four speakers was SEI's Aleks Szczerbiak who discussed the problems of measuring the quality of democracy in the post-communist states of Central and Eastern Europe. Simona Guerra presented her paper on 'Domestic proxies and European elections in central and Eastern Europe' in the panel on 'Voting behaviour in European parliamentary elections'. Emanuele Massetti ('The institutionalization of sub-state party systems in Scotland and Wales') and Gemma Loomes ('The impact of behavioural and institutional strategies on the fates of Western European established parties') presented in the panel on Party systems in the twenty-first century. Francis McGowan examined 'Fostering renewable energy- do parties make a difference?' in the panel on 'The politics of renewable energy: Institutions, policies and regulatory frameworks (III)'. Dan Hough, Michael Koss and Tania Verge analysed the chances of Red-Red coalitions ('On the possibility of red-red coalitions. The cases of Germany and Spain') in the panel on 'Government coalitions in multi-level settings: Institutional determinants and party strategy'. Paul Webb's paper on 'Two-party systems and political representation' was presented for him during the symposium on 'Representation and party systems: Is there a Crisis of Two-Party, Multi-Party or All-Party

System', as he was unable to make it to Pisa due to an air traffic controllers strike.

Monika Bil and Aleks Szczerbiak presented to a panel on 'Beyond Europeanisation? The (non-)impact of the EU on party politics in central and Eastern Europe' analysing the case of Polish party politics. This brought together both UK scholars and those based in the region to examine whether the process of European integration had any impact on party politics in Hungary, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Estonia, and Poland. The broad conclusion was that the influence of European integration has been limited so far to be compared with the outcome that some commentators had expected. They also discussed how to develop a set of methodological tools to generate a more comparative analytical framework in order to examine the phenomenon of 'Europeanisation' of party systems in the future. Two special plenary lectures were delivered by Giuliano Amato and Yves Meny on 'The EU fifty years after the treaty of Rome' and by Stefano Bartolini on 'The waning of cleavages: should we be bothered?' that drew significant interest among conference participants. A number of political scientists were also given awards by the ECPR including: Philippe Schmitter (Lifetime Achievement for an Outstanding Contribution to European Political Science), Giovanni Sartori (Mattei Dogan Foundation Prize in European Political Sociology) and Tanja E. Aalberts (2007 Jean Blondel PhD Prize).

Last but not least, the conference was held in the beautiful town of Pisa in the heart of Tuscany. This allowed conference participants not only to experience the intellectual challenge of discussing their research but also to admire the unique beauty of Pisa's marble famous old town, namely, the Piazza dei Miracoli. Unfortunately, the combination of fantastic weather and numerous outdoor cafes meant that some panels were less attended than one might have expected at such a massive conference – especially those held immediately after lunch! Overall, this conference proved to be a rewarding, friendly and stimulating intellectually event hosted in magnificent surroundings.

You can find out more about ECPR conference on the website

<http://www.essex.ac.uk/ecpr/events/generalconference/pisa/index.aspx>

Ongoing Research

This issue of *Euroscope* presents reports on the current research projects being worked on by Richard Black, Nat Copsey Lucia Quaglia and Tania Verge.

New European Immigration and Community Cohesion

Richard Black

Researchers in the Sussex Centre for Migration Research have been studying the experiences, perceptions, and aspirations of new immigrants from five Eastern European countries living in the London Boroughs of Harrow and Hackney, and the City of Brighton & Hove. The research, funded by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation, also explored how the presence of these new immigrants – from Albania, Bulgaria, Russia, Serbia & Montenegro, and Ukraine – affects community cohesion.

The rise of immigration from Central and Eastern Europe has attracted major media and policy attention in recent years, especially in the wake of EU enlargement in 2004. Home Office figures suggest that a total of 510,000 eastern Europeans from the eight countries that joined the EU in 2004 had come to work in Britain by the end of September 2006, although many of these may have already been living in the UK. However, this study focused on a group that has received less attention - immigrants from countries beyond the EU's borders.



Professor Richard Black

The East European immigrants interviewed in this study included both men and women, with an average age of 34. Most were married or cohabiting, and over 80% of their spouses were living in the UK. Over half of the women interviewed were university-educated, but only 33% of men. Nearly 40% had

been working as professionals before migration, whilst a quarter were students.

The immigrants in the study were found to have extremely high levels of employment in the UK, but most were working in low skill and low wage jobs – notably the hotel and restaurant sector, construction or 'other services' (mainly cleaning).

Both immigrant and long-term resident respondents reported quite high levels of social interaction with each other, and generally with people from other ethnic groups. However, immigrants interviewed were found to have a relatively low sense of belonging to their neighbourhood, and few participated in community activities.

What is community cohesion, and how do East Europeans fit in?

According to the Department for Communities and Local Government, a cohesive community is one in which:

- there is a common vision and a sense of belonging for all communities;
- the diversity of people's different backgrounds and circumstances are appreciated and positively valued;
- those from different backgrounds have similar life opportunities; and
- strong and positive relationships are being developed between people from different backgrounds in the workplace, in schools and within neighbourhoods.

This is a definition developed in the context of tensions between Muslim immigrants and 'local' communities in northern cities in 2001, but has not generally been applied to other communities, including East Europeans. With this in mind, we looked at each of these four aspects of community cohesion, to ask both whether East Europeans could be considered – or consider themselves – as living in a cohesive community, and if not, why not.

Sense of 'belonging'

Amongst our sample of new immigrants, only half as many expressed a sense of be-

longing to their neighbourhood as amongst long-term residents, and the population as a whole in the 2005 Citizenship survey. This appears to be a specific 'neighbourhood effect', since nearly twice as many said they *did* feel they belong to Britain – roughly equal to the proportion amongst long-term residents, and roughly equal to the proportion saying they belong to their home country.

Differences in the sense of belonging reported by immigrants appear to be explained in part by the period of time that they had spent in their neighbourhood, or in the UK. Those who felt they belonged strongly to their neighbourhood had lived there on average eighteen months longer than those who said they did not belong; whilst those who felt they belong strongly in the UK had been in the country on average three years longer than those who felt they did not belong. Those with children living with them in the UK were also more likely to say they belonged, as were men, those with less education, and those living in council accommodation.

Valuing diversity

Both immigrants and long-term residents agreed that the neighbourhoods they were living in were places where different people get on well together – more so than the population as a whole in the 2005 Citizenship survey. However, very few immigrants agreed that their neighbourhoods are places where people help each other. Immigrants were also less likely than long-term residents to say they talked frequently to their neighbours, although at least half of both groups reported talking to a neighbour at least once a week.

Rather more positively, both immigrant and long-term resident respondents reported quite high levels of social interaction with people from other ethnic groups. Levels of cooperation with work colleagues from other ethnic backgrounds were also high, with the vast majority of those working in ethnically diverse workplaces reporting that people at their workplace respect each other.

Expectations of life opportunities

Around half of the immigrants surveyed reported that they wish to return to their home

country at some stage. However, few felt this return was imminent – just eight individuals had fixed a date. Amongst those who intended to return, earning enough money in the UK was the most significant factor determining the date of return, followed by family and personal reasons, and an improvement in economic conditions at home.

Age, family status, educational background, length of stay in the country and intentions for repatriation were all significant factors shaping immigrants' expectations of future life opportunities in Britain. What surfaced as most important was a stable job that would pay enough for a decent life. Young people also often wanted to get good education and improve their English language qualifications:

"For myself, I expect one day to work in the field I worked at home (a manager) and not to do hard jobs that only immigrants would do. For my children, I want them to finish school and settle here". (Serbian man, aged 48, living in Brighton)

Community Participation

Under 25% of the immigrants interviewed felt that they could influence decisions at a local level, much lower than amongst long-term residents or for the UK population as a whole. They were also less likely to have volunteered, to have undertaken an action to solve a local problem, or to have given money to charity.

"I am not interested in volunteering. I have other things to do. I am renting and it is a landlord's job to be involved in the activities of the local community." (Russian man, aged 28, living in Harrow)

Relatively few immigrants were members of an association. Those who were, had mostly joined sports clubs. Those who had been in the UK longer were more likely to have joined an association. Also important were accommodation status and language ability.

About the project

This study was coordinated by Eugenia Markova, Richard Black and Ben Rogaly, and was based on a questionnaire survey of 388

new immigrants and 402 long-term residents, complemented by a range of qualitative research methods, including in-depth interviews with 21 immigrants and 8 long-term residents. The survey and in-depth interviews were conducted between June and November 2005. A snowball sample using multiple entry points was used to identify both immigrants and long-term residents living in the same neighbourhoods. The surveys contained 94 questions and were administered in immigrants' own language by a specially-trained team of immigrant researchers.

For more information, contact

migration@sussex.ac.uk

The Wider Europe Network

Nathaniel Copsey

On 7 June 2007, the Wider Europe network held a seminar on the relations between the EU and its eastern neighbours, concentrating this time on the next generation of agreements between the EU and its new neighbours. Speakers included: Simon Green (European Research Institute, Birmingham), on the German presidency; Derek Averre (ERI) on Russia and the EU, Kasia Wolczuk (ERI) on Ukraine and the EU, and Julian Cooper (ERI, Birmingham), on EU-Russia trade relations. Further comments were provided by Iryna Solonenko of the International Renaissance Foundation in Kyiv and three of the Wider Europe network's convenors: Alan Mayhew (SEI); Nathaniel Copsey (ERI, Birmingham); and Christophe Hillion of Leiden University.

The seminar was followed in August by a panel at the ICCEES Regional Conference in Berlin. At this event, Alan Mayhew, Christophe Hillion and Nat Copsey were joined by Rainer Lindner (SWP, Berlin) and Olga Shumylo of the International Centre for Policy Studies in Kyiv.

Negotiations on a new agreement between the EU and Ukraine are likely to continue well into the autumn and winter. Ukraine's pre-term parliamentary election will also

take place on 30 September. Consequently, the Wider Europe network will reconvene again in 2008.

If you would like more information about the Wider Europe network, please visit our website: <http://wider-europe.org> or contact Nat Copsey, n.copsey@bham.ac.uk

Financial Services Governance in the European Union

Lucia Quaglia

In March 2007 Lucia was awarded a small British Academy grant to conduct fieldwork on a project on *Financial Services Governance in the European Union*. For the purposes of this research, the governance of financial services in the EU includes: i) the institutional framework through which policies are made; ii) regulation (including, de-regulation and re-regulation), which comprises market-making and market-framing measures; and iii) supervision, that is the monitoring and enforcement of regulation as well as the practical cooperation between supervisory authorities.

The project mainly focuses on the functioning of the so-called Lamfalussy committees in banking and securities regulation and supervision. So far, she has conducted two rounds of interviews in Brussels, one round of interviews in Paris, and several interviews in London. The interviewees were officials from the national treasuries and financial supervisory authorities, the Commission, the level 2 and 3 committees, the representatives of financial associations and individual companies. On the basis of the material gathered through fieldwork, she published an SEI working paper that sheds light on these relatively 'new' and understudied committees. See Quaglia, L (2007), 'Committee Governance in the Financial Sector in the European Union',



Dr Lucia Quaglia

SEI Working Paper No. 96.

The Framework Programme 6 Integrated Project 'INTEGRATED AND UNITED (INTUNE)' funded by the European Union is fully underway. The project is based on three systematic and inter-connecting surveys covering citizens, members of parliament, and policy experts involved in EU committee governance. The empirical fieldwork for the expert survey revolves around a questionnaire administered to high-level policy-makers sitting on EU-level committees in the areas of better regulation, information society, taxation, economic and monetary policy, foreign policy, and pension reform. Prof Kenneth Dyson (University of Cardiff), Katja Seidel (research assistant to the project) and Lucia conducted a series of interviews with members of the Economic and Financial Committee and Economic Policy Committee.

The members of the groups were asked important questions on EU governance, representation and identity, with a view to producing empirical information on the beliefs and norms about governance and representation of the regulators, and whether a common identity is emerging as a result of socialisation processes at the EU level. The fieldwork is now completed, and the team are in the process of analyzing the data. The writing up process is also fully under way.

'Visiting Fellowship'

Tania Verge

In December 2005 I met Paul Webb and Tim Bale in the ECPR joint sessions held in Granada when I was still writing my dissertation. The panel was on the issue of 'Democracy and Political Parties'. Since then we kept contact with each other and Tim Bale had the generosity of reading some parts of my dissertation and drawing very useful comments. We met again in Leiden in February 2006 as I was invited to give a presentation about 'The Spanish centre-right and civil society' at the ESRC Seminar Series on the contemporary Right in Europe co-organised by Petr Kopecký and Tim Bale.

After defending my PhD, I decided to apply for a postdoctoral scholarship to continue my

research abroad, and focusing it on political parties, the University of Sussex became one of the obvious places to carry it on.

I am very grateful to all members of the Politics and Contemporary European Studies Department who

gently helped me to gather all the information related to the research application centre and deal with all the bureaucratic paperwork required by the Spanish Ministry of Education. I still remember a week when my e-mail account was full with messages from all the staff providing me with lots of information to help me to justify my scholarship application. And this helping hand was extended to other daily life issues including finding an apartment.

Overall I have spent a whole year at Sussex, from August 2006 to July 2007. It has been a very productive year regarding the various research lines about political parties I have undertaken, undoubtedly favoured by the intellectually rich and motivating environment of the department.

The conferences and research seminars organised by the department as well as the permanent disposition of its people to critically read each other's work has definitely been an added value to my stay that has allowed me to submit several papers to academic journals and participate in various conferences as well as to co-author a couple of articles with Dan Hough (on the facilitating conditions for 'red-red coalitions') and Tim Bale (rebranding processes in the main British and Spanish political parties).

The department also gave me the opportunity to teach on several courses, an experience which I really enjoyed and that provides me with an extra experience for my future teaching at the Pompeu Fabra University (Barcelona).



Dr Tania Verge

SEI Dispatches

An update on the activities of SEI members across Europe.

‘The EU budget. An unanswered question’

Jarosław Pietras

Finance Ministry Poland, SEI
Visiting Practitioner Fellow

As we approach revision of the EU budget and its policies it should be recalled that some time ago, six countries, net payers, sent a joint letter to the President of the Commission requesting that future budgets should be no bigger than 1% of the collective GNI of the Union. This happened even before the Commission prepared its first proposal of the Financial Perspective for 2007-2013. Spending less taxpayers' money and economizing is generally a healthy intention. But still was there some economic reasoning behind this 1% figure or simply was it a nice round figure easy to defend in political dispute? Economic analysis might lead us to say that the EU budget should not exceed 0.8% or even 0.5% of the collective GNI of the Union or on the other hand that it should be changed in the opposite direction to say 1.2% of GNI. The question therefore remains, why precisely 1% of GNI?

While attempting to answer this question it is necessary to place the EU budget in the context of the wider finances of the EU. In heated debates of who should pay less, and who should receive more, the sole concentration is on visible amounts that are transferred between national treasuries and the EU Commission and back from Brussels to member states. This is the balance which the media focus on and which makes politicians feel accountable in front of their own constituencies.

Yet the real benefits and costs for any member state go far beyond the Union budget. The EU can impose obligations on member states to implement legislation and this has an impact on expenditures. The EU can also diminish the expenditures of the member

states – it could enforce legislation on public aid generally prohibiting expenditures by national public bodies to help ailing companies. The EU could also enforce increased regulation of public or private spending, by forcing governments to establish additional regulatory bodies, or requiring companies to comply with certain environmental standards.

But here is the problem! EU related expenditures are not confined to amounts contained in the EU budget. The cost of EU legislation and decisions are born by citizens, businesses, local and national governments and finally the EU budget. The latter is only the tip of the iceberg visible to the public but with no clearly defined proportions to the rest of the less visible EU related expenditures. In an interview with the Financial Times in October 2006 EU Enterprise Commissioner and Commission Vice-President Günter Verheugen said that EU legislation costs European business €600bn (£405bn) a year, on the basis of a new evaluation methodology of the administrative costs of red tape. This does not reflect additional costs to consumers, and national budgets. It should be compared to just over €100bn of the European yearly budget. Thus one could say that the total cost of Europe is multifaceted and more complex than people generally think. Obviously it must be emphasised that if there was no EU legislation, domestic regulation for businesses might be equally costly, and a lack of common regulations would add to the costs to business when operating under different legal and technical regimes outside of the own member state.

In general the finances related to the EU should be analyzed on at least three levels. The most easily visible being the European budget, much less visible are the national public finances at both central and local levels, and even more difficult to reveal are those expenditures paid by private business and consumers. The money transferred to the EU budget is only a small part of all the cost of Europe incurred by EU policies and legislation. Is it worth trying to cover all these costs? This comes down to a value judgment but I think that they are generally

desirable aims for all EU members. It doesn't mean that the similar outcomes could not be obtained with smaller costs, or that the utility of some EU designed measures could not be treated in some member states with the different sense of urgency. However, having European legislation and common or coordinated actions fully budgeted can bring significant savings or ensure more or less visible value added at the European level.

It is frequently argued that the EU budget is mostly based on calculations of relative wealth (with some alterations caused by different VAT levels, frontier facilities or abatements and other facilitations) since contributions to the common budget are mostly GNI-related and collection of VAT which is at least partially harmonized. However, as mentioned above, the costs of the EU are not limited to the EU budget. The larger part of these costs to Europe is paid within the territory of the member states from their own budgets and out of private pockets. The allocation of burdens is therefore more complex. For some countries EU legislation appears less costly and less difficult to implement but for others, particularly the less wealthy Member States, EU related expenditures represent a greater fraction of the domestic public expenses. Therefore, overall costs of Europe are a heavier burden for these member states.

How does this relate to the issue of the 1% GNI EU budget? This demand presented by the net payers to reduce the size of the EU budget was not to change EU policies and reduce their total costs. The negotiations on the Financial Perspective 2007-2013 were



Jarosław Pietras

not resulting in the significant modification of EU policies and the rearrangement of expenditures. Its objective was to affect burden sharing between the EU budget (visible as a tip of an iceberg) and the national level (not distinguishable by the public as EU related expenditures). The increasingly frequent de-

mands to renationalize the Common Agricultural Policy are having a similar impact. Rarely are there notions to reformulate the substance of this policy, and more is said about shifting part of its costs to the national level, thus making the CAP less common and 'European' but equally costly to taxpayers and consumers since its basic features remain unchanged.

The logic of having a 1% limit to the European budget undoubtedly goes far beyond economics and initial question remains unanswered.

'Poland's Influence in the EU: the Case of its Eastern Policy'

Nathaniel Copsey
European Research Institute,
University of Birmingham, SEI
Visiting Academic Fellow

In April 2007, I moved to the SEI's 'sister' institute at Birmingham University, the European Research Institute, to take up a three-year research fellowship. My research project seeks to investigate the influence of Poland on the European Union and, in doing so, to contribute to the wider scholarly debate on the relationship between the European Union and its Member States. The focus of much of the academic research on the EU and its Member States has been on the issue of Europeanization, both as a concept and as a process (Olsen, 2002). Far less attention being paid to the study of the influence of a given Member State on the European Union.

Leading scholars of the relationship between the EU and its Member States have identified this deficiency as the most pressing question for future research on the governance of the European Union (Bulmer and Lesquesne, 2002). This project aims to assess the impact of Poland on the European Union. In doing so, it adopts an intergovernmental approach, looking at the capacity of the na-

tional government of Poland to exercise power and influence within the European Union. Power is understood in a one- and two-dimensional sense (Lukes, 2005), that is in a one-dimensional sense as impact on decision-making in the EU 'on issues where there is an observable conflict of (subjective) interests', together with the two-dimensional sense of power, that is the ability to exercise influence, persuasion and coercion to secure a particular outcome.

The third dimension of power (Lukes, 2005) (shaping subconscious preferences norms and values) will not be employed since Poland has been a Member State for too short a period of time to assess any meaningful change – moreover, this third dimension of power is very difficult to assess empirically. Liberal intergovernmentalist (LI) theory (see Moravcsik, 1991, 1993, 1998, p. 5) suggests that the outcome of decisions on the road to European integration can best be explained through the relative power of Member States and the intensity of their preference for a particular policy choice.

Moravcsik argues that two kinds of factors are crucial in understanding how policy preferences are formed in a given Member State: economic and geopolitical, of which Moravcsik believes the former to be the most important. Some scholars have questioned whether LI can explain European integration entirely, arguing that Moravcsik 'does not capture the complexity of preference formation' (Kassim and Dimitrakopoulos, 2004), although conceding that LI is the 'most ambitious of the attempts to explain ... the dynamics of the [European integration] process' (p. 243). The proposed research will assess empirically the assumptions of LI in order to judge its usefulness for understanding: (a) preference formation in Poland, and, following on from this, (b) how Poland exercises power and influence in the European Union.

A project that sought to measure preference formation and the influence of Poland on every aspect of EU policy-making would be very difficult to operationalise, therefore this study narrows the focus down to a more manageable sub-field, and concentrates on the area of policy-making that arguably is of greatest strategic interest to Poland: relations with the EU's eastern neighbours.

Following the liberal intergovernmentalist approach, Poland is likely to exercise the greatest influence in the EU on those policy areas where its preferences are the most intense (Moravcsik, 1997, 1998). Therefore,



Dr Nathaniel Cosey

if Poland to exercise any particular power and influence over one policy domain in the European Union, it is likely to be in the field of relations with the EU's eastern neighbours. Poland's expertise in relations with the EU's eastern neighbours, and desire to influence policy towards them, extends particularly to three states: Belarus, Ukraine and Russia.

A brief review of Poland's activities in the field of the EU's relations with its eastern neighbours, shows that Polish policy has been largely unsuccessful so far where it has tried to upload new foreign policy initiatives (a membership perspective for Ukraine, engagement with the Belarussian government) onto the EU agenda. It is more successful where it exercises negative influence on policy towards Russia (i.e. the veto on the replacement for the PCA) because the other Member States appear to have entrenched national interests that are too far removed from the Polish perspective. If this is to be explicable through LI theory, then Poland either does not have sufficiently strong policy preferences in the field of relations towards the eastern neighbours, or its political weight in Brussels is simply not strong enough. The latter of these two appears to be the key factor.

Before turning to the hypotheses that spring from the above analysis that this project will test, it is worth noting that policy towards the EU's eastern neighbours is an unusual domain that is neither foreign policy nor enlargement, nor can the relationship be subsumed under the heading of neighbourhood policy since Russia does not participate in this. Whilst the role of the Commission in formulating policy in this area has been studied (Kelley, 2006), as has the function-

ing of the policy, (Cremona, 2005; Cremona and Hillion, 2006) the role of the Member States has been subject to less academic scrutiny. Decisions on relations with the eastern neighbours are subject to unanimity within the EU, which has a serious effect on the way in which power and influence may be exercised in this field. That said, the hypotheses the project will investigate are as follows:

Preference Formation

H1: *That economic factors are more important than geopolitical factors in understanding the formation of Polish policy preferences in the EU.*

H2: *The influence of Polish business on policy towards to the eastern neighbours is high, and the policy preferences of the Polish government in Brussels reflect this.*

Exercising Power and Influence

H3: *Poland's policy preferences towards Russia are incompatible with those of large Member States with heavy political weight (e.g. France and Germany), therefore its capacity for uploading policy preferences is low.*

H4: *The greater the level of threats and coercion exercised by the Polish government in relations with Russia (e.g. the veto of talks on a new PCA), the greater its level of power and influence will be, since this is a policy area that is subject to unanimity.*

H5: *Given that Poland has a relatively weak political weighting in the EU, the more Poland takes into account the preference intensity of the other Member States in the field of relations with the eastern neighbours (e.g. French opposition to a membership perspective for Ukraine), the greater its level of power and influence will be.*

If you are pursuing similar research interests and looking at another Member State, or are simply interested in my findings, I would like to hear from you, please e-mail me on either:

n.copsey@bham.ac.uk
n.w.copsey@sussex.ac.uk

SUSSEX EUROPEAN INSTITUTE (DEPARTMENT OF POLITICS & CONTEMPORARY EUROPEAN STUDIES)

Paul Taggart

*Professional Development Workshops
Autumn Term 2007*

This is a series for research students in the SEI aimed at issues of professional development and they will take 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 4 (October 16) 11.00-12.30

Workshop 1: The Research Student: 'Start-Up Kit'

This workshop is aimed at newer research students and will cover the issues of planning your research and thinking about what it means to be a research student.

Paul Taggart

Week 5 (October 30) 11-12.30

Workshop 2: Graduate Teaching Issues

This workshop is designed to cover the issues arising from teaching as a graduate student with a particular emphasis on balancing teaching and dissertation as well as on teaching issues

Ed Maxwell and Paul Taggart

Week 8 (November 20) 11-12.30

Workshop 3: Presenting Your Research

This workshop is aimed at planning presentations of your research for conferences, job-talks and seminars.

Paul Taggart and Sabina Avdagic

Week 9 (November 27) 12-13.30

Workshop 4: The Process of Journal Publication

This workshop will cover the process of journal publication for articles and can give you insights from the editorial process.

Paul Webb

Submissions to Euroscope

Euroscope welcomes submissions for its Spring-Term issue. Please send information for the SEI Diary, short articles on ongoing research projects or reviews of events by the deadline of 1 December.

E-mail submissions to Euroscope:

euroscope@sussex.ac.uk

Or contact Euroscope Editor Dan Keith

D.J.Keith@sussex.ac.uk