Policing the Frontier in post-Stockholm Europe

Dundee, 25 February 2011

Maria O’Neill, University of Abertay Dundee

The second annual conference of the Policing and European Studies research network was held at the University of Abertay Dundee on the 25th February 2011. The Policing and European Studies research network aims to bring together researchers from a wide variety of disciplines in order to develop a focus on EU developments of relevance to the law enforcement community, broadly defined. This aim was reflected in the papers presented at the conference. The call for papers for 2011 focused on the impact of policing the frontier in Post-Stockholm Europe, with the December 2009 Stockholm Programme focusing on the further development of the external relations of the EU in the area of law enforcement.

Unlike the 2010 conference, when counter-terrorism and the use of the military in policing were notable themes, the focus of the papers submitted for the 2011 conference had a clearer focus on traditional cross-border policing activities. Papers were presented from a variety of disciplinary perspectives with international cocaine trafficking into the EU, the trafficking in human beings, and general border policing dominating the discussion. Equally the post-Lisbon issue of the hierarchy between the ECJ and the ECtHR for non-conviction based sanctions was also discussed.

Discussions by the participants at the conference, however, highlighted the lack of papers from the perspective of computer-aided cross-border law enforcement, and it is intended to draft the call of papers for 2012, inter alia, to reflect the need for research in this developing area.

continued on page 2
New Collaborative Research Networks

Romanis in Europe

www.ecmirom.org

Romanis in Europe sees itself as an interdisciplinary network initiative that brings together scholars, researchers and practitioners sharing a specific interest in limitations of present European policies aiming at Roma integration. The specific interest of the network lies with the evaluative research with the focus on policies targeting Roma communities, allowing their geographic mobility and determining their relationship with the national and the European institutions.

Euroscepticism

www.uaces.org/euroscepticism

In the two decades since the emergence of the European Union with the Maastricht treaty there has been a concerted attempt to build a European political space, typified by the debates on constitutionalisation and democratisation. Much less noticed by both academics and practitioners, but no less important, has been the mobilisation of publics, interest groups and political parties against the integration process. The Collaborative Research Network (CRN) aims to explore and understand this range of responses – usually, if not always accurately, labelled as eurosceptic – with a view to developing a rounded and considered multi-disciplinary analysis.

The CRN on Euroscepticism will be holding its first workshop at the University of Surrey on 8 July 2011.

The workshop will set out the state of the art in research in the field, taking in a range of perspectives, including theoretical, methodological and practitioner-related questions. The aim of the workshop is to set out a programme of work for the network, with a view to supporting and connecting existing work by individuals, as well as looking forward to potential collaborative projects.

The workshop will start at 10am, running until and is free to all participants.

Chair’s Column

Richard Whitman, University of Bath

In this issue of UACES News we report on the winners of the Reporting Europe Prize 2011 (page 6-7). This is the fourth year that the prize has been awarded and is now a well-established feature in the calendar of media awards - but it is unique in its intention to reward stimulating reportage on European integration.

The prize is jointly awarded with Thomson Reuters, the leading international news agency. It is UACES’s chance to recognise the quality journalism that assists our members in deepening our understanding of today’s Europe. Quality reporting on Europe is of key interest for our Association, involved as it is in promoting research and teaching in European Studies, as well as bringing together academics with practitioners active in European affairs.

Nominating for the Reporting Europe prize is open to all our members and we rely on the membership to nominate quality journalism that you listen, watch and read and the journalists who make our explanation, understanding and teaching of Europe possible. For those of us who teach and research on Europe the broadcast and print media is essential to keeping up-to-date with our areas of interest. News on Europe provides us with a constant streamed opportunity to validate, or challenge, the ways in which we seek to understand Europe’s political, economic and cultural practices and processes.

The prize is judged by a panel of both journalists and academics and the jurors look to recognise work which excels in stimulating critical debate on European integration. The jury considered a wide variety of work on all aspects of EU current affairs in 2010. The shortlist covered a diverse range of topics, from the crisis in the Eurozone to the rise of the far right in Europe. You can see the quality of the journalism that was included in the shortlist as it can be read and listened to at www.reportingeurope.eu. Richard Lewis and Emily Linnemann worked extremely hard to make the ceremony an occasion to remember for the award winners and for the audience drawn from the media, business, embassies, think tanks and UACES members.

And the winners were... Gail Champion (producer) and Angus Stickler (reporter), BBC Radio 4 and the Bureau of Investigative Journalism for the radio programme ‘File on 4: Europe’s Missing Millions’ first broadcast 30 November 2010. Please give the programme a listen (and also look at the work of the other short-listed journalists). You will be heartened by the fantastic quality of reporting on Europe from which we continue to benefit.
The Best of Intentions: are EU biofuels policies on the right road?

Brussels, 21 April 2011

Rob Ackrill, Nottingham Trent University and Adrian Kay, Australian National University

The latest UACES ARENA seminar in Brussels saw Rob Ackrill and Adrian Kay tackle the important and timely question of EU biofuels policy, before a large audience representing a diverse range of organisations and stakeholders. They reported initial findings from their research project, supported by the UK Economic and Social Research Council, analysing the dynamics and drivers of biofuels policies in the EU, USA and Brazil. The project has involved interviewing over 40 leading policy-makers and industry representatives across these three policy centres.

In this fast-moving sector, strategically vital in the EU’s ambitions for the transition to a low carbon economy, the research has uncovered more questions than answers – and this seminar offered a knowledgeable forum for discussion of those questions.

The seminar began with an overview of EU biofuels policy, considering why there was a policy focus on first generation biofuels; and why that focus emerged when it did. Attention then switched to identifying some of the features and consequences of this particular policy path pursued by the EU. First, incomplete legislation – notably with the Renewable Energy and Fuel Quality Directives being published without sustainability criteria agreed, then those criteria being published without indirect land use change issues being addressed – creates overlapping cycles of policy-setting and policy implementation. This has introduced policy uncertainty into the biofuels market, the setting of usage mandates notwithstanding.

Second, a gap is opening up between an increasingly settled policy environment for conventional biofuels and an environment for advanced biofuels that remains highly uncertain. Conventional biofuels are seen by many as a ‘bridge’ technology – but where the future lies and how long it will take to get there remain uncertain. Yet policy-makers have placed great faith in these new technologies to deliver renewable energy goals better than current technologies; within just a few years.

What is also uncertain is whether the current market, dominated by conventional biofuels used mainly in standard internal combustion engines, may create technological lock-in – especially as both the car and agricultural industries now have a vested interest in the technological status quo. One suggestion was that innovation in alternative engine technologies could come from countries such as Japan, whose car-makers would in turn reap the benefits.

Policy uncertainties also abound. EU biofuels usage mandates necessitate imports. In turn, sustainability criteria have been established to ensure the greenhouse gas emissions performance, along the supply chain, is better than the fossil fuels being replaced. This, however, reveals considerable new policy challenges for the EU – in seeking to influence production conditions for agricultural products on farms thousands of miles away; then ensuring products deemed to have been produced sustainably can be traced through to the forecourts of EU petrol stations. In part, such concerns arise because EU policy appears to have developed without explicit consideration of the balance between supply and demand. Thus, having laid down usage (demand) mandates, further action was necessary to address supply-side issues, notably significant environmental concerns over a ‘green’ product.

The talk finished with a cautionary look into the future. The current policy, with targets for 2020, and initial discussion over the policy direction to 2050, raise questions about the vulnerability of the policy – to waning political commitment, to countervailing political activity and pressures, to market and technological uncertainty.

The lively discussion covered a wide range of issues. Contributors drew on their own professional experiences to offer additional observations about specific issues, from problems faced in Germany from petrol blended with 10% ethanol, to issues surrounding the delay in agreeing and implementing the sustainability criteria and land use change measures. Questions were raised over whether EU policy was compatible with the EU’s international trade obligations, whether biofuels policy was a response to CAP reform, whether a commodity used in internal combustion engines was really an efficient use of resources in the fight against climate change, and how biofuels affect the global south.

Meetings such as this show we are getting better at asking the right kinds of question about biofuels. The ongoing challenge is to find answers that can help resolve the dilemmas of EU biofuels policy.
The Idea of a University

Anne Corbett, London School of Economics and Political Science

Let me claim my 60 seconds of fame as (another) visiting fellow at the London School of Economics. I can confirm that the post is unpaid, the desk is hot and, in my case at least, the noise atrocious. If it is not Westminster Council road-drills in the morning, it is the pub next door after 1600.

However, what drives me to write is not the case of the LSE, but of universities in general. The present frenzy over misjudgments, possible misdeeds and shoddy practice in some (or maybe many) British universities is nasty, and tips the balance too far.

I am as fed as up as the next person with the fact that degrees might be awarded which sully an institution’s reputation; that donations might be dodgy; and that there are some greedy vice-chancellors.

I hope that allegations of university offices renting out the vice-chancellor’s own Swiss chalet are unfounded, and that not all external university-related earnings - such as for serving on the Higher Education Funding Council for England board - go into the vice-chancellor’s pocket (in any case, why isn’t it standard practice to pass them back to the university?).

I also regret as much as anyone the nauseous academic celebs boosting the brand, attracting students and - guess what - never being present to teach.

Yet on the issue of the future of universities, we should surely think more about the principles for which we want modern universities to exist.

I’ve dug out one of the lectures I remember most clearly from my doctoral days. It was a lecture Fred Halliday gave at the LSE on 7 May 1998, on the function of universities, entitled “What May We Understand, and Not Understand, by the International University”.

Halliday, celebrated for his wide-ranging analyses of global politics, had something perceptive to say here too. I believe his thinking helps to steer a debate as to what universities today may aspire to.

Halliday’s concern was with what globalisation was possibly doing to universities. He presciently saw globalisation as a form of internationalisation quite unlike that associated with universities’ traditional collegiate academic collaboration. The risk, he maintained in a memorable phrase, was that universities would turn into “shopping-malls of the mind”: there to serve drop-in customers.

The way to avoid this, he said, was to go back to the basics of what a university is, as advanced by such major intellectuals as Ralf Dahrendorf, George Steiner and Ralph Miliband: namely, a guarantor of creative tension in which knowledge, intellect and skills were held in balance.

With this in mind, he went on to argue that the distinctive function of the university is to keep that tension: between scholarship and engagement, abstraction and application, teaching and research.

That is the frame in which academics exercise their functions of imparting ideas and knowledge, encouraging students to think and training them in the skills and knowledge relevant to the modern world. Together these factors enable a university “to stimulate and to endure”.

Thirteen years on, the risks of customer-based university education are greater. It is now the consensus among policy-makers that higher education is predominantly a private good.

The evidence is everywhere: in the tuition-fees issue that convulsed British universities in autumn 2010; in the British government’s cavalier ‘saving’ of public funds by removing financial support for teaching in the arts and social sciences; in the much stronger managerial culture; in the ever-tighter regulation of government funding; and in the necessity to appeal to the market for private support.

All these serve to sideline the academic, and along with them the notion of higher education, as in large part a public good.

As I have moved from journalism to academia, one of my life’s interests is to be regularly in contact with academics who live out the values Fred Halliday described, helping to ensure that their institutions and their disciplines “stimulate and endure”.

I see them at the LSE. I see them in the discipline-based associations to which I belong, and I see them in countries to which my work has taken me in the last few years: Russians, German and British academics working together in Freiburg; Croatian and Greek academics acting on their international networks to shake up some cosy arrangements that history has helped to perpetuate in their national system. I saw the same thing last summer when teaching the politics of European higher education at the University of Oslo, with some extremely rigorous students from several parts of the continent.

Halliday ended his 1998 lecture with a favourite (if surely apocryphal) story, one which would grace his repertoire in later years too. It concerned the Chinese students in Japan in the early 1900s who translated The Communist Manifesto. Their version of its most famous phrase was: “Scholars of the World, Unite. You have Nothing to Lose but Your Shame.”

Today, that is not a bad rallying-cry for those who fight on for strong universities to be part of the public good.

This article was first published on www.opendemocracy.net under the title “The idea of a university: Fred Halliday’s truth”. It is republished with permission.
The EU Citizens’ Initiative: Normative, Legal and Policy Perspectives
Liverpool, 6 May 2011

Samantha Currie, University of Liverpool

The University of Liverpool recently hosted a one-day conference on the EU Citizens’ Initiative. The conference was co-funded by the European Commission Representation in the UK, UACES and the Liverpool Law School.

The Lisbon Treaty made provision for the introduction of a novel instrument of direct democratic participation in the EU’s decision-making processes. According to the Treaties, the Citizens’ Initiative (CI) permits a sufficient number of Union citizens from a significant number of Member States formally to request that the Commission consider a given proposal for EU action. The aim of the Liverpool conference was to bring together critical, interdisciplinary and comparative analysis of the new CI.

The morning session contributed to an overview of the proposed working of the CI as well as highlighting some important critical viewpoints as to the workability and effect of the CI rules as contained in Regulation 211/2011. Mr Jens Nymand-Christenssen (Director of the Secretariat-General, European Commission) presented a paper that explored the development of the CI and discussed the ways in which the new instrument might be utilised by citizens. Professor Michael Dougan (University of Liverpool) gave an assessment of the legal intricacies of the various rules relating to the implementation of the CI. Professor Graham Smith (University of Southampton) analysed the CI’s position within the framework of previous democratic experimentation by the EU. Thoughtful analysis was provided by Professor Jo Shaw (University of Edinburgh) who acted as discussant.

In the afternoon, the focus shifted to encompass analysis of the CI at the national level. Dr Mads Qvortup (Cranfield University), presented a paper which analysed the effect of national citizens’ initiatives in a number of EU Member States. Mr James Organ (University of Liverpool) then linked the development of the CI with constitutional change in the UK and posed some questions about future developments in this area. Finally, Luis Bouza Garcia (Robert Gordon University, Aberdeen) explored the impact that the new CI could have on the relationship between the Commission and organised civil society. Dr Charlotte O’Brien (University of York) acted as discussant.

Space – The Final Frontier
Angers, 11 March 2011

Thomas Hoerber, ESSCA

On Friday 11 March 2011 the Centre for European Integration organised a UACES-sponsored workshop on ESSCA’s Paris campus on the topic “Space – The Final Frontier. What potential for a European Space Policy?”

The workshop took place at the ESSCA campus in Paris. After a short welcome coffee and an introduction into ESSCA School of Management’s activities, Thomas Hoerber, the workshop convenor, started the research session off with a conceptual piece on the direction of the European integration process and why space policy might become important for integration dynamics.

Emmanuel Sigalas, from the Austrian Academy of Sciences, continued with early, but very promising research results on the positions on the European Parliament on Space Policy. His piece was followed by a joint paper on the danger of an arms race in space presented Max Mutschler, from the University of Tübingen, and Christophe Venet, from the Paris-based IFRI think-tank. Pawel Frankowski, from the Maria Curie-Sklodowska University in Lublin, concluded the morning session with a paper on the politics of including some African countries in European space endeavours.

The afternoon session was started off by Rik Hansen, from the University of Leuven, who explained some of the legal intricacies of European space policies, while Martin Caudron, from Euralia Consulting, highlighted the problems in the Public Private Partnership which was originally designed to pay for Galileo. Paul Stephenson, from Maastricht University, presented concepts of actorness and what that might mean for the EU becoming a leader in space projects. The intensive and compact workshop was rounded off by David Rees, ESSCA, who used the problems in the Galileo space projects as a metaphor of the European integration process as a whole and its difficulties to remain “on track”.

The study group which is ultimately meant to grow out of the collaboration between the participants, will consider publication of revised papers in a special issue of an academic journal. One immediate output is a panel to be held at the 2011 UACES Conference in Cambridge.

For further information, please contact the organiser Dr Thomas Hoerber (Thomas.Hoerber@essca.fr).
Launched only four years ago, the Reporting Europe prize awarded annually by UACES and sponsored by Thomson Reuters has consistently produced a shortlist of high-calibre nominees for the prize jury to mull over. This year’s competition was no exception with pieces on the debt problems of Greece, the crisis in the Eurozone, lax controls on EU spending and the challenge of the far right in Europe all vying to take the prize. With its emphasis on ‘reporting’, the prize has understandably drawn nominations from the more traditional media of print journalism, radio and television. Yet it is clear that new forms of media are changing the way that Europe is reported and discussed. Never before have we had access to the kinds of technology that allow us to participate in conversations about Europe. This poses a challenge for the future direction of the prize. However, its original mission was to showcase the very best of reportage on Europe in the English language and this year’s winners, Gail Champion and Angus Stickler (BBC Radio 4 and Bureau of Investigative Journalism: File on Four, ‘Europe’s Missing Millions) have more than lived up to that measure. The continuing success of the prize is, of course, dependent on the quality of the nominations and UACES members will soon be invited to get involved in the process for the 2012 competition.

2011 Prize Shortlist

Tony Barber, Saving the Euro, Financial Times
(11-13 October 2010)

Gail Champion and Angus Stickler, File on 4: Europe’s Missing Millions, BBC and Bureau of Investigative Journalism (30 November 2010)

Bronwen Maddox, How the Greeks Broke Europe, Prospect Magazine (23 May 2010)

Ian Traynor, Series of pieces on the far right and immigration in Europe, The Guardian (April-November 2010)
“There is a quality to Ian Traynor’s reporting that draws the reader into his stories. His reporting has a compelling ability to explore political trends by connecting local-level developments to wider pan-European processes. Always engaging, his pieces are must-reads.”

“Maddox’s piece evokes the urgency of the Greek economic crisis for all those affected, and does so in a way that conveys the multi-layered and complex nature of events with a likely impact far beyond Greece, and with implications for the very future of the European Union. This is journalism at its finest.”

Barber’s articles reveal a depth of research into the opinions and motives of European decision-makers grappling with fast-moving events. They can claim, like the best of journalism, to serve as “the first draft of history”, sometimes reading as if dictated from the meeting rooms in Brussels where Europe’s financial fate was hanging in the balance.”

UACES would like to thank the following individuals for sitting on the Prize Jury:

Dr Martyn Bond, Deputy Chair of the London Press Club

Dr Mary Farrell, University of Greenwich

William Horsley, UK Chair of the Association of European Journalists

Janet McBride, Thomson Reuters

John Palmer, Advisory Council of the Federal Trust

Professor Richard Whitman, UACES Chair and Chair of Jury

BBC File on 4
Europe’s Missing Millions

From Mafia-controlled companies to energy projects that never got off the ground, this edition of Radio 4’s ‘File on 4’ exposed significant levels of fraud in the spending of the EU’s Structural Funds. It was a co-production by the BBC and the Bureau of Investigative Journalism.

William Horsley speaking on behalf of the jury praised the in-depth research which made the programme’s revelations credible, and the outstanding skill with which it laid bare stories of deception and abuse in Sicily and elsewhere. By taking their evidence to the responsible EU institutions in Brussels, the programme-makers demonstrated the need for more accountability, if such expensive projects in the name of European solidarity, are to win public support.

Gail Champion, the producer of ‘Europe’s Missing Millions’, joined BBC Radio News and Current Affairs in 2009 as a Senior Broadcast Journalist on Radio 4’s ‘File on 4’ programme.

Angus Stickler is chief reporter at the Bureau of Investigative Journalism. He joined the Bureau after 16 years as a staff reporter at the BBC.

Accepting their award, Gail Champion and Angus Stickler acknowledged the valuable contribution made by Federico Gatti and Caelainn Barr, Bureau of Investigative Journalism, in the production of the piece.

Listen to the original broadcast and watch a film profiling all of this year’s shortlisted nominees at: www.reportingeurope.eu
EU External Policy Implementation

Bath, 6-7 May 2011

Daniel Wunderlich, University of Bath

The Department of Politics, Languages and International Studies at the University of Bath hosted a UACES-funded workshop on 6 and 7 May 2011 that was entitled ‘Implementing EU External Policies in Non-Member States’. The fourteen speakers travelled from all around the UK, Europe and as far as Egypt to discuss empirical findings and theoretical avenues to account for dynamics in this novel and exciting area of research.

In four panels participants discussed dynamics in diverse EU policies such as human and economic rights promotion, aid policy, education, ‘good governance’, external migration policy, bio-fuels, sustainability and trade policy. The panels adopted hereby an EU ‘supply side’ perspective, considered the ‘target’ perspective and different EU policy instruments. Besides insights from Bosnia, Turkey, Albania and Macedonia, focus was particularly set on implementation in non-member states outside the accession process such as Morocco, Ukraine, Armenia, Georgia, Egypt and as far afield as Brazil. Especially the implementation contexts in the latter countries provide complex challenges for EU attempts at achieving its policy objectives ‘on the ground’ and triggered fruitful and thought-provoking discussions about the role of administrative capacities, conditionality, uncertainties, mismatching institutional structures and policy approaches. Drawing on the Europeanization and external governance literature, organisational sociology, public administration and public policy, our findings indicate a number of ways in which the literature on compliance and policy transfer needs to be adapted to take account of the uncertainties of implementation context and challenges to EU policy implementation in non-member states.

We are happy to have received generous support from the University of Bath and UACES to enable us to run this workshop and support the participation of both established academics and young researchers as well as provide support to attending PhD students. At the end of the workshop, we discussed joint publication plans in form of a special issue in an internationally recognised quality academic journal as a first follow-up from this meeting in the enjoyable Georgian surroundings of Bath.

Assessing The EU 2020 Strategy

Durham, 11 February 2011

Christian Schweiger, Durham University

The CRN on the future of the EU Single Market in the global economy was founded in 2010 and analyses the impact of the changes in the global economy on national economies in Europe, with a particular emphasis on the United Kingdom, Germany, Hungary and Poland.

The first annual workshop concentrated on a critical analysis of the EU’s new ‘Europe 2020’ strategy.‘Europe 2020’ is an attempt to revise the previous Lisbon Agenda in the wake of the global economic crisis by encouraging member states to work towards economic competitiveness, flexible labour markets as well as higher levels of social cohesion and environmental sustainability. Lothar Funk (University of Applied Sciences, Düsseldorf) presented a critical assessment of the strategy in respect of its goal to create ‘knowledge economies’ and he was optimistic that the strategy could assist member states to develop a more coordinated response to the current external pressures. On the other hand the combination of budgetary austerity and labour-orientated targets remains controversial in many member states. Tasneem Ahmed (University of Manchester) presented a detailed analysis of the various mechanisms of Europe 2020, particularly in relation to the ambition to achieve higher levels of social inclusion in the member states. Guest speaker Stephen Hughes (MEP and Vice President of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the EP) gave an insight into the origins of the strategy and criticised it for being too focused on fiscal austerity. Hughes presented a summary of an alternative approach of the PG group in the European Parliament which emphasises the need to create high quality employment on the basis of a ‘growth and employment pact’. Bela Galgoczi (European Trade Union Institute for Research, Education, Health and Safety, Brussels) presented a paper on the impact of the global economic crisis on the new member states in Central and Eastern Europe in which he stressed that their export-dependence had emerged as an obvious but inevitable risk factor during the crisis. He argued that competitiveness could be secured on the basis of skilled labour but ‘Europe 2020’ with its focus on budgetary restraint and labour market flexibility would actually threaten to undermine national employment standards.

Maciej Duszczyk (Warsaw University) concentrated on the important issue of how migration is affecting national labour markets, particularly in Germany and Austria after the end of restriction on workers from CEE member states this year. Duszczyk expects the level of new outward migration from Poland to markets, particularly in Germany and Austria after the end of restriction on workers from CEE member states this year. Duszczyk expects the level of new outward migration from Poland to the new member states in Central and Eastern Europe in which he stressed that their export-dependence had emerged as an obvious but inevitable risk factor during the crisis. He argued that competitiveness could be secured on the basis of skilled labour but ‘Europe 2020’ with its focus on budgetary restraint and labour market flexibility would actually threaten to undermine national employment standards.

Macleod presented a critical assessment of the strategy in respect of its goal to create ‘knowledge economies’ and he was optimistic that the strategy could assist member states to develop a more coordinated response to the current external pressures. On the other hand the combination of budgetary austerity and labour-orientated targets remains controversial in many member states. Guest speaker Stephen Hughes (MEP and Vice President of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the EP) gave an insight into the origins of the strategy and criticised it for being too focused on fiscal austerity. Hughes presented a summary of an alternative approach of the PG group in the European Parliament which emphasises the need to create high quality employment on the basis of a ‘growth and employment pact’. Bela Galgoczi (European Trade Union Institute for Research, Education, Health and Safety, Brussels) presented a paper on the impact of the global economic crisis on the new member states in Central and Eastern Europe in which he stressed that their export-dependence had emerged as an obvious but inevitable risk factor during the crisis. He argued that competitiveness could be secured on the basis of skilled labour but ‘Europe 2020’ with its focus on budgetary restraint and labour market flexibility would actually threaten to undermine national employment standards.

Further info: www.uaces.org/single
Teaching European Studies Post-Lisbon

London, 12 May 2011

Simon Lightfoot, University of Leeds

The shared experience of teaching the European Union and European Studies across a number of EU states was the focus of a one-day workshop, generously sponsored by C-SAP (the subject centre for Politics) and supported by UACES and the Standing Conference of Heads of European Studies (SCHES). The birth of the discipline, common challenges and options for the future formed part of a broad roundtable to kick off the day with Mike Mannin (Portsmouth University), Paul Stephenson (Maastricht University) and Sue Milner (Bath University and Chair of SCHES). Maria Bell from the LSE European Documentation Centre, then highlighted useful sources of information on the EU and highlighted the role EDCs still play.

After lunch, the first session examined the broad issues associated with the European Studies curriculum. These included an example of curriculum re-design from Maastricht University, examples of embedding employability in the curriculum from Newcastle University and UEA and a case study of how using student peer mentors increased the take up of ERASMUS opportunities in Loughborough University.

The final session outlined the pedagogic benefits (and challenges!) of taking students on field trips to learn about the EU from St. Louis University-Madrid, the innovative blended learning modules and programme on offer at the Free University in Brussels (VUB), the use of social bookmarking to keep students on top of development in the EU from University of Leeds, and a paper on the pitfalls and benefits of multi-disciplinary teaching.

Overall, the day showed the keen interest amongst UACES members for opportunities to discuss issues related to teaching and learning. The willingness of the participants to share ideas and offer top tips meant the day was a friendly and informative event. The workshop outcome was the creation of an informal network of scholars interested in teaching and learning and plans to organise further events/panels at the 2012 UACES conference in Passau.

Further info: Simon Lightfoot (s.j.lightfoot@leeds.ac.uk)

Reporting on the EU? Issues and Impact

Brussels, 5 May 2011

At a one-day training seminar for journalists at the Institute for European Studies, Leigh Phillips editor of the EU Observer and Annamarie Cumiskey, senior journalist at the London Bureau for Investigative Journalism both talked about the deficiencies of the EU institutions and their policies. Phillips pointed to the problem of the EU institutions democratic deficit and bad impact that one has on the investigative journalism. Cumiskey presented the research project pointing to the problem of the responsibility on the EU/national level and the EU regional funds ending in the hands of the organized crime in Italy.

The Diplomatic System of the EU: Strategic and Structural Diplomacy

Leuven, 7-8 April 2011

Stephan Keukeleire and Dimitri Renmans, University of Leuven

What are the new development in the analysis and practice of diplomacy? And what lessons can be drawn for the diplomatic system of the EU? These were the central questions discussed during the second workshop of the Jean Monnet Multilateral Research Group on “The Diplomatic System of the EU” (DSEU), which is a network with the Universities of Loughborough, Maastricht and Leuven as its core members.

The workshop at the University of Leuven started with a keynote lecture by Christer Jönsson (Lund University) on “Supranational and transnational diplomacy”, followed by a panel debate with Christer Jönsson, Brian Hocking (Loughborough) and Jan Wouters (Leuven). An interesting debate ensued from this on post-modern diplomacy and EU diplomacy. During dinner Baron Frans van Daele (Chief of Staff to the President of the European Council) unfolded his views on the practice of EU foreign policy after Lisbon.

The second day started off with a session on ‘strategic diplomacy’ with case studies on EU-China and EU-India by Michael Smith and Dave Allen (Loughborough), followed by a lively discussion on what strategic powers and strategic action are. The second session focussed on ‘structural diplomacy’, with case studies on Kosovo and the DRCongo by Stephan Keukeleire (Leuven / College of Europe), Arnout Justaert (Leuven) and Arben Kalaja and Artan Çollaku (MEI, Kosovo). The focal point of the debate was the concept and practice of alignment as part of a structural diplomacy. For a summary of the debates and the related DSEU Policy Papers, see www.dseu.lboro.ac.uk
June...

PhD workshop on Political Economy of Integration
Edinburgh, 10 June 2011
info: www.uaces.org/319

Developments in Contemporary Citizenship
London, 10 June 2011
info: www.uaces.org/325

EU Agencies and their External Relations
The Hague, 10 June 2011
info: www.uaces.org/329

1st Annual General Conference of European Political Science Association
Dublin, 16-18 June 2011
info: www.uaces.org/286

Europeanization of ‘exclusion policies and practices’
Neuchâtel, 16-17 June 2011
info: www.uaces.org/315

The European Neighbourhood Policy: Aims and Impacts
Leicester, 18 June 2011
info: www.uaces.org/342

Council for European Studies Eighteenth International Conference
Barcelona, 20-22 June 2011
info: www.uaces.org/227

Where now for Europarties? Reflections post-Lisbon
Masstricht, 20-21 June 2011
info: www.uaces.org/301

Lobbying in Brussels - Dirty Tricks or Legitimate Business?
Brussels, 22 June 2011
info: www.uaces.org/347

1st Global Conference Europe Inside-Out: Europe and Europeanness Exposed to Plural Observers
Vienna, 23-25 June 2011
info: www.uaces.org/351

Still an Angry Nation? Turkey’s politics under scrutiny
London, 23 June 2011
info: www.uaces.org/357

Comparative Perspectives on the Substance of EU Democracy Promotion
Ghent, 24 June 2011
info: www.uaces.org/283

Statewatching Europe: Civil Liberties, the State and the European Union
London, 25 June 2011
info: www.uaces.org/356

50th Anniversary London-Leiden Conference on European Law
London, 25 June 2011
info: www.uaces.org/361
Facing EU policy failures in the Middle East - the new Arab Awakening  
Brussels, 30 June 2011  
info: www.uaces.org/336

Sport&EU 6th Annual Conference  
Nottingham, 30 June - 1 July 2011  
info: www.uaces.org/289

New Frontiers in European Studies: UACES Student Forum 12th Annual Conference  
Guildford, 30 June - 1 July 2011  
info: www.uaces.org/newfrontiers

July...  

20 Years on from the Collapse of the Soviet Union: Prospects and Opportunities for Conflict Settlement in the post-Soviet Space  
London, 4 July 2011  
info: www.uaces.org/334

27th EGOS Colloquium: Reassembling Organizations  
Gothenburg, 7-9 July 2011  
info: www.uaces.org/294

Euroscepticism  
Guildford, 7 July 2011  
info: www.uaces.org/358

6th International Conference in Interdisciplinary Social Sciences  
New Orleans, 11-13 July 2011  
info: www.uaces.org/289

The Governance of Sustainability  
Angers, 21-22 July 2011  
info: www.uaces.org/322

August...  

16th Nordic Political Science Congress  
Vaasa, 9-12 August 2011  
info: www.uaces.org/288

Third Global International Studies Conference  
Porto, 17-20 August 2011  
info: www.uaces.org/296

6th ECPR General Conference  
Reykjavik, 25-27 August 2011  
info: www.uaces.org/166

UACES 41st Annual Conference  
Cambridge, 5-7 September 2011  
info: www.uaces.org/cambridge
Recent Books

A Constitutional Order of States? Essays in EU Law in Honour of Alan Dashwood
Anthony Arnott, Catherine Barnard, Michael Dougan & Eleanor Spaventa (eds)
Hart Publishing
ISBN: 978-1849460460
GBP: 75.00

The High Representative for the EU Foreign and Security Policy
Gisela Müller-Brandeck-Bocquet & Carolin Rüger (eds)
Nomos
ISBN: 978-3832960025
EUR: 54.00

The US-EU Security Relationship: The Tensions between a European and a Global Agenda
Wyn Rees
Palgrave Macmillan
ISBN: 978-0230221857
GBP: 24.99

Framing Europe: The Policy Shaping Strategies of the European Commission
Mark Rhinard
Republic of Letters Publishing
ISBN: 978-9089790453
EUR: 39.00

Statelessness and Citizenship: A Comparative Study on the Benefits of Nationality
Brad Blitz & Maureen Lynch (eds)
Edward Elgar
ISBN: 978-1849800679
GBP: 75.00

Statelessness in the EU: Displaced, Undocumented, Unwanted
Brad Blitz & Caroline Sawyer (eds)
Cambridge University Press
ISBN: 978-0521191937
GBP: 65.00

National and European Foreign Policy: Towards Europeanization
Reuben Wong & Christopher Hill (eds)
Routledge
ISBN: 978-0415610841
GBP: 80.00

Italy and the European Union
Federiga Bindi
Brookings / SSPA
ISBN: 978-0815704966
GBP: 19.99

The European Union as a Small Power: After the Post-Cold War
Asle Toje
Palgrave MacMillan
ISBN: 978-0230243965
GBP: 57.50

New Labour and the European Union: Blair and Brown's Logic of History
Oliver Daddow
Manchester University Press
ISBN: 978-0719076411
GBP: 14.99

New Labour and the European Union: Blair and Brown's Logic of History
Oliver Daddow
Manchester University Press
ISBN: 978-0719076411
GBP: 14.99

An Emergent European Executive Order
Jarle Trondal
Oxford University Press
ISBN: 978-0199579426
GBP: 53.00

European Foreign and Security Policy
Catherine Gegout
University of Toronto Press
ISBN: 978-1442610347
CAD: 27.95

More books are listed at: www.uaces.org/bookshop
The Euro Crisis and Interdisciplinarity

Miguel Otero-Iglesias, UACES Student Forum Chair

In my relatively short career as a scholar of European Studies I have discovered that interdisciplinarity is the ‘catch-word’ of our times. It is promoted by the Government, it is advocated by the most distinguished academics and it is a must in every research grant application with any chance of success. Unfortunately, I have also discovered that it is easier to talk about interdisciplinarity than to undertake it. One good example of how genuine interdisciplinary work is sometimes neglected and misunderstood is the field of International Political Economy. IPE is such an interdisciplinary research subject that it hardly finds space in mainstream debates. For International Relations scholars, IPE is too economic to engage with, while for ‘proper’ economists IPE is too enmeshed in political discussions. While the aim of Susan Strange, the pioneer IPE scholar in Britain, was always to bridge the gap between international economics and international relations, sometimes I feel that IPE, instead of building bridges, has fallen down the cliff.

For some, the reason for this failure is that IPE is just too complex. It touches on International Relations, Politics, Economics, Finance, Economic History, Sociology, International Law and a long etc. Yet, as the global financial crisis has shown the world is a complex, interconnected place which is impossible to understand, let alone predict, through only one academic discipline. Does this mean that IPE is now again fashionable as it was in the 1970s with the oil crises, stagflation, the collapse of Bretton Woods and the apparent decline of the US? Hopefully. Similar great transformations are unfolding before our eyes: the growth patterns in the global economy of the past decades are being questioned, the economic and, with it, the political power balance is shifting to the East and, most importantly for European studies, the future of the euro is at stake, and with it the European integration project as a whole. While IPE has been neglected in European Studies, the euro crisis has shown that now more than ever it is vital to study the interconnectedness between political power, economic clout, financial intermediation, and monetary sovereignty pooling at the regional and global level.

In this regard, I am delighted to announce that at the next UACES Student Forum conference, which this year will be held at the University of Surrey from 30 June to 1 July 2011, we will hear keynote speeches from Profs. Ben Rosamond, Kenneth Dyson and Michael Smith. The first two have constantly shown us through their work that IPE, and concretely European Political Economy, should not be neglected, while the latter has shown in practice that interdisciplinarity is possible and enriching. Given this line up, and the promising graduate panels that we have in the programme (one of them on matters of IPE), I think for once I will go to a European Studies conference and actually discuss the euro crisis.

Announcing the Winner of the JCER Prize


Her article uses rationalist and constructivist explanations of co-decision in the European Parliament (EP). It seeks to understand the change in the policy preferences of the EP during negotiations on the ‘Returns’ directive – dealing with the voluntary or compulsory return of irregular immigrants. A long-standing advocate of civil liberties in the Area of Freedom, Security and Justice, the EP was expected to raise the standards of protection for third-country nationals. In view of the inability of the EP to construct a more liberal policy, the study uses two institutionalist approaches to understand why the EP was unsuccessful in raising the standards. The empirical application of the models highlights the necessity to integrate rationalist and constructivist understandings of co-decision in order to understand motivations for policy change.

Date for the Diary

Monday 7 November 2011
European Studies Research Students’ Conference
Europe House, London

The Student Forum is a voice for students with an active interest in European Studies. Through research networks and events, it facilitates dialogue and the exchange of information between students at different institutions.
Election Results

As ever, the UACES Committee elections were closely-contested. We are grateful to all those who stood for election and to everyone who voted.

As current Committee member Susan Banducci, has been elected to Secretary, the first runner-up for the Committee elections was invited to complete her final year of office as a Committee member.

We are pleased to introduce the new Secretary and three newly elected Committee members:

Susan Banducci: Susan is professor in politics at the University of Exeter and associate dean of education in the College of Social Sciences and International Studies. She has been an active member of UACES committee for 18 months and is looking forward to furthering her involvement as UACES secretary.

Paul James Cardwell: As a co-opted member of the UACES committee, Paul has offered invaluable support in the organisation of this year’s conference in Cambridge. He is a senior lecturer at the University of Sheffield and deputy director of the Sheffield Centre for International and European Law.

Maxine David: Maxine is a long-standing UACES member. She has been instrumental in organising this year’s UACES student forum conference and is committed to providing further support for postgraduates and early career researchers. She is based in the Department of Politics at the University of Surrey.

Carmen Gebhard: Carmen, a UACES member since 2007, is currently a teaching fellow at the School of Politics and International Studies at the University of Nottingham. She has a strong interest in reinforcing the role of UACES as a forum for the advance of teaching practices in European Studies.

Concern raised over the impact of higher UK fees on students undertaking year abroad

The move to a higher student fee regime in the UK creates uncertainties for the future of European Studies. A key issue of concern is the impact on the year abroad for students studying languages. Students studying a year abroad will face an additional fee for their year of overseas study and which may represent a disincentive to opt for a four-year degree programme. It looks set to be a further disincentive for study abroad within the EU and where the UK already has a poor track record in student mobility, even when the Erasmus programme is included.

A group of UK subject and language associations has come together to lobby the UK Government and Parliament to more actively consider the benefits that accrue to the UK from overseas studies – and the costs if these opportunities were to diminish. UACES has joined this grouping and the text of a joint letter to Rt Hon David Willetts MP, Minister of State for Universities and Science can be viewed at www.uaces.org/6808. We hope to be able to publish the Minister’s response.

Summer Schools 2011

European Integration
Kristiansand, 20 June – 6 August 2011
www.uaces.org/6801

EU Law and Policy on Immigration and Asylum
Brussels, 4-15 July 2011
www.uaces.org/330

The European Decision-Making Process
Brussels, 4-16 July 2011
www.uaces.org/6802

Governance in the EU
London, 4-22 July 2011
www.uaces.org/6803

The EU and the World
London, 4-22 July 2011
www.uaces.org/6804

Countering Terrorism in the Post- 9/11 World
The Hague, 22-26 August 2011
www.uaces.org/6805

Disarmament and Non-Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction
The Hague, 28 August – 2 September 2011
www.uaces.org/6806
New Teaching Methods

Gabriele Suder, Jean Monnet Chair at SKEMA Business School and in charge of SKEMA’s Microsoft Partnership, is delighted to announce the first Office 365 beta-led multicampus course, using professional social network tools to work on common projects.

This course ‘Doing Business in Europe’ and the accompanying video/podcast - series (part of which can be consulted on YouTube) are co-supported by the EU’s Lifelong Learning program.

The course is simultaneously running across three international sites (USA, France, China) using the newest methods of course delivery, including ‘sharepoint’ and ‘livemeeting’. Virtual delivery is complemented by presence, at various points throughout the semester, in the different locations.

www.youtube.com/user/skemabstv

Call for Papers: Upcoming Deadlines

15 June 2011
Multi-Mode Governance: Shaping and Being Shaped by Globalisation
Florence, 16-17 December 2011
www.uaces.org/341

26 June 2011
Debating Toleration: Attitudes, Practices and Institutions
Pavia, 3-5 November 2011
www.uaces.org/338

31 July 2011
Towards a European Society? Transgressing Disciplinary Boundaries in European Studies Research
Portsmouth, 28-30 June 2012
www.uaces.org/344

UACES Email List...

Too many emails?
There is more than one way to receive messages from the email list.

Index or Digest: Receive emails as a weekly summary.

Regular: postings to the email list arrive as individual messages in your inbox.

To find out more about regular, index or digest options and how to change the way you receive emails visit:
www.uaces.org/email
The European Parliament

The EU is a complex organisation and its many institutions and their roles are often difficult to understand for the citizens in and outside of Europe. The lack of public knowledge about how the EU works and affects them is one of EU’s major problems. The European Parliament Former Members Association (FMA) has picked up the challenge and created its “EP to Campus Programme”.

Through the programme, the FMA makes it possible for universities to benefit from the expertise and experience of former Members of the European Parliament who will visit their campuses and share their insights into how the EU institutions really work and what factors shape EU decision-making. The FMA works in partnership with the European Commission’s Jean Monnet Action and the former members hold their lectures pro bono to keep the cost as low as possible for universities. Since 2006 many successful events have been organised all over the world, in such diverse countries as Italy, Malta, Istanbul, Romania, Poland and the USA.

Interested universities are most welcome to contact the FMA secretariat. The secretariat will then aim to match the requirements of the institution for the specific event with the FMA members that have expertise about the topic. The FMA sends a shortlist of names from which the university will make its final pick. The university is always in charge and decides on the final candidate.

To find more information about how to apply for the programme, please visit our website www.formermembers.eu, “EP to Campus” section. Information is available in English and French.

The Public Sector of the Future

Judith Clifton, University of Cantabria

The ideas underlying the New Public Management concept created major expectations, but what came of all this? Did all citizens benefit in the same way from the government reforms and what are the major successes and issues according to public servants? And how will the financial crisis impact Public Sector reforms?

Judith Clifton will work in team in a research project investigating the impact of more than 20 years of government reform on the basis of the New Public Management concept in Europe. The research will examine whether the government reforms have contributed to more efficiency, more effectiveness, a better policy and more satisfied citizens. The key criticism levied against the changes in the Public Sector was that in their aim for realising savings and efficiency they led to a major fragmentation of policy and to greater social inequality. Ideological arguments are, however, monopolising the debate and a sound empirical foundation is often lacking.

The research will make use of an opinion survey as well as government statistics and reports. In the second year, 3,000 top level public servants in 10 European countries will be interviewed. Finally, the research will develop scenarios for the future of the Public Sector in Europe in collaboration with an international group of experts and policymakers.

The research is financed as a Collaborative Project by the Seventh Framework Programme of the European Commission. The European Commission is investing €2.7 million in this project as part of its research into ‘The Public Sector of the Future’. The entire undertaking is coordinated by the Public Administration Department of Erasmus University Rotterdam.

Info: www.cocops.eu
JCMS Prize for Best Article

The JCMS Editors would like to congratulate both Tracy Slagter (University of Wisconsin Oshkosh) and Raya Kardasheva (now at King’s College London) for sharing the JCMS Prize for the best article in Volume 47.

Tracy was chosen for her article ‘National Parliaments and the ECJ: A View from the Bundestag’ which appeared in Volume 47(1), pp. 175-197.

Raya, formerly at LSE, was chosen for her article ‘The Power to Delay: The European Parliament’s Influence in the Consultation Procedure’ in Volume 47(2), pp. 385-409.

New Director

Patrick Pasture (Global European History) becomes the new director of the interdisciplinary master programme ‘European Studies: Transnational and Global Perspectives’ at the University of Leuven. He succeeds Stephan Keukeleire, who has directed the programme for three years and who remains vice-director.

Innsbruck Group on European Research (IGER)

www.ig-er.info

The joint dynamics of widening and deepening push the EU always more in the direction of a multi-level governance system. Moreover, these factors show the interesting interface between empirical and normative analysis. The new Innsbruck Group on European Research IGER (Department of Political Science, University of Innsbruck) will concentrate its work on the following two subject areas: multi-level governance policies and legitimacy, and integrative characteristics of the EU Security and Defense Policy.

CITSEE: New Domain, New Look

www.citsee.eu

Focusing on the overarching theme of Citizenship in Southeast Europe. The high-quality academic journalism includes photo reportages, stories, and essays. It aims at reaching a wider academic community, practitioners, activists, NGOs, politicians, policy-makers, lawyers and ordinary citizens across Southeast Europe that are interested in citizenship and related issues.

Call for papers opens 14 October 2011

PASSAU 2012

UACES 42nd Annual Conference
3-5 September 2012

Call for papers opens 14 October 2011
Centrum för Europaforskning, Lunds Universitet

The Centre for European Studies at Lund University was founded in 1997 in order to strengthen the university’s European profile. The centre’s aim is to encourage research, education, and long-term competence in European studies and to develop external contacts, both nationally and internationally. It provides a network for co-operation among faculties, departments and researchers, primarily within the social sciences, humanities, economics and law. The centre connects around two hundred scholars that have declared an interest in European Studies.

For the centre the concept of European studies implies research on developments in all of Europe, as well as on the relations of Europe to the other parts of the world. The main focus of European studies lies though on processes of political, cultural and economical integration in Europe and related issues such as the relations between EU member states and their neighbours or the flow of culture and ideas across the continent.

The centre organises open seminars and lectures on European topics in order to further knowledge about European issues and encourage informed discussion, and arranges and provides grants for scientific conferences on European topics. We support the publication of scientific works on European topics written by researchers from Lund University, and publish conference reports and anthologies from our own conferences and seminars.

European Studies, University of Dundee

More than Jam, Jute and Journalism on the banks of the river Tay

The European Studies programme is located in the College of Arts and Social Sciences at the University of Dundee, and taught by staff from the Schools of Humanities, Economics and the Environment as a multidisciplinary field of study as a joint degree pathway. The Scottish MA system allows great flexibility and choice in the first 2 years of study, then specialising in year 3 (MA) and year 4 (MA Honours) in European Studies and the other joint subject pathway.

Students may combine their studies with one or two European languages and can opt to spend part of their time abroad. The main partners currently are the Universities of Freiburg, Burgos and Grenoble, but other options are available depending on the other degree subject pathway.

Multidisciplinary core modules in year 1 (The Globalising World) and year 2 (Contemporary Challenges for Europe) lay the foundation for further study. In years 3 and 4 students focus on European Union Politics and Political Extremism in Europe combined with either language study or the intercultural module.

An important task for the centre is to initiate multidisciplinary research programs. Most recently the centre has launched such a program in Memory Studies. Initially we focused on conflicts in connection with memories of expulsions and genocide of population groups in 20th century Europe, but now the scope of the program also includes a wider set of themes, such as memories of wars and of life under authoritarian regimes. A key focus for the project is the uses of memory for political mobilisation since the late 1980s. The program involves researchers from various countries and from several disciplines within the Humanities and the Social Sciences. In 2009 the Nordic Research Council provided a grant for the establishment of a Nordic research network in Memory Studies (www.cfe.lu.se/towards-a-common-past). The network – Towards a Common past – is led by the Centre for European Studies and includes researchers and research institutions from all Nordic countries and Estonia.

www.cfe.lu.se

All of our Group Members are listed at:
www.uaces.org/groupmembers

European Studies, University of Dundee

‘Vision of Europe’. Most students opt to write their dissertation in European Studies with an intercultural focus.

The European studies team teaches and researches across a wide range of topics such as European Visual Cultures, Continental Philosophy, European Politics and History and Applied Language and Cultural Studies as well as Contemporary Literature, Economics, Geography and International Peacekeeping.

www.dundee.ac.uk/cestud
Why Researchers Should Blog

Anamaria Dutceac Segesten, University of Copenhagen

“Publish or perish”: Academia has its own jungle law. To thrive (or even to survive) one needs to produce texts. Articles, book chapters, monographs, conference papers, working papers, book reviews – you name them – these are the certificates of an academic’s ability to think creatively, analytically and methodically, to produce and communicate new knowledge.

This is where blogs come in. Blogs are useful for researchers for at least three reasons:

- They are good for your writing skills.
- They are good for your research.
- They are good for your CV.

Let us examine each of these statements separately.

Writing is a form of exercise; you need practice in order to get better at it. Writing is also very much a matter of inspiration: how many of us have stared at the blank screen worrying about how to fill it with our thoughts? Blogging may be just as good as chocolate in fighting writer’s block, because it lifts the pressure of putting down well-rounded, thoroughly referenced texts and allows for the ideas that float around in your head to find a home on (virtual) paper. Blogs help you to improve the content of your academic production. Your research can be made better by keeping a blog, which becomes your personal ideas incubator. Because of their format, blog posts allow you to focus on one, max two, things at a time. This may serve to organize your thoughts, categorize your concepts or data, and help you look at your material in a new way. Once you publish a post, you can receive feedback through comments. That may correct some statements you made, or help you see new angles on the same topic.

Keeping a blog can be part of your fieldwork strategy. Should you be doing some qualitative interviews or narrative analysis you could show your impressions from the field written on your blog to your informants, who have the chance to contribute new insights, to take back statements or nuance previous ideas. You can keep in touch better with your field contacts, thus building trust and a more solid relationship over time. In terms of qualitative field work, blogs can be a place where you can display your non-verbal data: pictures, drawings, videos that normally do not have room in regular journals.

Finally, keeping a research blog helps you with your CV because it gets your name out in the open and strengthens your academic profile. Having a blog lets you develop other social media skills, like scheduling posts, linking to like-minded writers and so on. And let us not forget that it is increasingly acceptable and merit-giving to publish in non-traditional media (for example we have recently seen the case of Wikipedia contributions being considered as part of the tenure portfolio).

This article originally appeared on the Ideas on Europe blog and is reproduced by kind permission of the author.

Want to start a research euroblog? Ideas on Europe is your platform! Sign up today.
Until recently, the European Union tended to view violent mass conflicts predominantly through the lens of negotiations between conflict leaders and powerful external actors. Today, the EU has begun to recognize the imperative of understanding and influencing developments on the ground in conflict situations by engaging with local civil society.

The European Union, Civil Society and Conflict explores the EU’s relations with civil society organizations at the local level, in an effort to improve the effectiveness and relevance of its conflict and peace strategies. Looking in particular at the eastern and southern neighbourhoods, the volume analyses five case studies of EU and local civil society interaction in: Georgia & Abkhazia, Nagorno-Karabakh, Moldova & Transnistria, Israel & Palestine and Morocco & Western Sahara. Through the comparative examination of these cases, this volume draws broad policy guidelines tailored to governmental and non-governmental action.

ISBN: 978-0415596718