EU Member State Building in the Western Balkans

Soeren Keil, Canterbury Christ Church University

The European Union’s (EU) current enlargement policy is framed within the Stabilization and Association Process. This was designed to prepare the countries of the former Yugoslavia (and Albania) for membership of the EU. However, unlike other enlargement rounds before, what we can observe in the post-Yugoslav states is a more active involvement of the EU in proper state- (and nation-) building exercises. From reforming the police in Bosnia to establishing the rule of law in Kosovo, the EU is an active state-builder in countries that remain internally and externally contested.

Having said this, the EU could be considered as a ‘state-builder in denial’ as its representatives in the post-Yugoslav countries continue to treat highly political issues such as constitutional reforms, censuses or security sector reforms as technical, rather than political issues. This leads to misconception from both sides, the EU does not understand why important reforms and decisions are not achieved and/or implemented, and the elites in the post-Yugoslav countries remain skeptical about their country’s EU prospects and about further engagement with EU elites. Above all, citizens in the Western Balkans remain alienated, disappointed by their national leaders who fail to implement reforms and disappointed by the EU, which fails to offer viable political alternatives.

continued on page 3

Berlin, 11-12 October 2013

Christian Schweiger, Durham University & José Magone, Berlin School of Economics and Law

The purpose of this event was to discuss contributions for a forthcoming special issue of the academic journal Perspectives on European Politics and Society and a subsequent jointly edited book, which will both be dedicated to analysing the impact of the eurozone sovereign debt crisis on the cohesion of the EU. The event was funded by UACES, the Fritz Thyssen Foundation conference support programme and the Berlin School of Economics and Law.

The papers presented at the conference addressed the potential of an emerging economic and political centre-periphery cleavage under the current crisis conditions in the Eurozone, which has started to threaten the cohesion of the Single European Market. The discussions between participants at the conference focused on the recent awareness of centre-periphery relations and the emergence of differentiated integration between multiple cores within the European Union. In this respect the conference examined the strategies in the periphery and core countries and at supranational level to overcome potential divisions within the EU.

The introductory session (Attila Agh, Budapest Corvinus University; Brigid Laffan, European University Institute; Daniela Schwarzer, Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik; Christian Schweiger, Durham University) made an attempt to contextualise the eurozone crisis by examining the political and social implications of the emerging post-crisis governance framework. Session II examined the international dimension of the crisis with a particular emphasis on the EU’s foreign and security policy as well as its normative power (Carolin Rüger, University of Würzburg; Edward Yencken, University of Melbourne). In Session III participants (Stefan Auer, University of Hong Kong; Lothar Funk, University of Applied Sciences; Bela Galgoczi, European Trade Union Institute) addressed the fundamental problem of an emerging core-periphery divide from comparative national perspectives. The concluding sessions IV (Maciej Duszczyk, Warsaw University; Oliver Kovacs, Budapest Business School; Angelos Sepos, Al Akhawayn University) and V (Marie-Janine Calic, Ludwig Maximilian University; Ismini Lefa, University of Manchester; José Magone, Berlin School of Economics and Law; Peter Zervakis, German University Rectors’ Conference) tried to offer a theoretical perspective on the analysis of the crisis in the context of the economic and social reality in selected member states.

The emerging consensus amongst conference participants was that the new policy mechanisms are inevitably orientated towards tighter supervision and coordination of domestic fiscal and macroeconomic policies. At the same time many papers highlighted that the policy mechanisms in response to the crisis lack strategic vision. Most of all they do not adequately address the growing lack of public support for the EU and the grave social effects of the crisis.
The EU perspective

At its 2003 Thessaloniki Summit the leaders of the EU Member States made a promise to the countries of the former Yugoslavia and Albania: It was pointed out that their future lies in Europe, as full Member States of the EU. Hence, they were characterized as ‘potential candidate countries’ and a clear promise towards EU enlargement to include Southeastern Europe was given. This commitment came as a result of European failure during the Yugoslav Wars, first in Croatia and Bosnia in the early 1990s and again at the end of the century during the conflict in Kosovo. Instead of symbolizing the ‘Hour of Europe’ as demanded by leading European elites, these conflicts became an example of the EU’s weaknesses: Slow decision-making processes, no military capacity and a lack of support for any military intervention. These conflicts were solved by the intervention of NATO, mainly through US leadership. The new political agenda that emerged after the Kosovo conflict in 1999 therefore focused on highlighting the EU’s transformative power in the post-war societies that have emerged in Southeastern Europe. State weakness, organized crime, contentious bilateral relations and a lack of democratic governance remained important issues in many countries of the region even after the peaceful revolutions in Croatia and Serbia in 2000.

The new Stabilization and Association Process focused on addressing some of the legacies of these conflicts, while at the same time preparing the countries for membership of the EU. In contrast to previous enlargement rounds, there is a greater focus on conditionality and on the direct involvement of the EU in specific reforms. Numerous EU missions, including a military mission in Bosnia and the rule of law mission (EULEX) in Kosovo, were also designed to help these countries overcome some of the legacies of the past and focus on political and economic integration. However, while the political commitment was very important, what became more and more obvious in the years after 2003 was that the integration of the region would be more long-term and would require deep-rooted change in all countries.

Hence, the EU became directly involved in individual reform processes. Sometimes this happened through direct intervention as in the cases of Bosnia and Kosovo, sometimes it happened through indirect pressure as was the case in Croatia and Macedonia. The use of conditionality remains a key component of EU foreign policy towards the post-Yugoslav states.

EU Member State Building

The reason for the EU’s more active role in the post-Yugoslav states is on the one side the need for more deep-rooted democracy-enhancing reforms that help stabilize and consolidate the states, and on the other side the recognition by EU representatives that the reform process in the region will be long-term and needs to focus on stabilization as well as progress in EU integration. This in itself is not a problem, in fact it could be argued that a stronger EU engagement in the region is a good thing and helps political elites and populations in Southeastern Europe to become aware of the massive challenges connected to EU accession.

EU engagement in the region focuses on technical issues. In fact, the European Commission, but also the Member States treat enlargement and connected political reforms as technical issues, following the logic of “Here is the acquis communautaire, this is what you have to do, now deal with it!” Yet, EU integration and political reforms as such are political issues, and they remain highly contested. In some countries elites have no interest in reforms, because it would upset the current status-quo, which profits these elites. The lack of progress on constitutional reform in Bosnia can be explained with this argument, so can the lack of internal democratization in Kosovo. Milo Djukanovic’s half-hearted commitment to the fight against corruption and his negative rhetoric against critical media outlets in Montenegro can also be explained by focusing on the protection of the status-quo.

As a consequence of treating reforms in the context of enlargement as technical issues, there are a number of negative developments observable. First, the citizens of the countries in Southeastern Europe become more and more frustrated with the EU. They often strongly support EU integration, but political elites fail to implement required reforms, and the EU fails to take citizen and civil society perceptions into account. Second, political elites in the region are strengthened through the current framework and remain key veto-players. This can have some dramatic consequences, as the recent discussions about a cut of funding for Bosnia demonstrates. Finally, the EU is getting more and more tired of enlargement and engagement with the Western Balkans region. The Eurocrisis and immigration are new priorities on the agenda, and the EU’s approach towards Southeastern Europe continues to favor stability over democracy.

What is needed is a radical change in the EU’s approach. A new enlargement policy needs to focus on engaging with citizens and civil society organizations and needs to punish parties and elites which act as spoilers. To do this, the EU needs to clearly define its framework for enlargement and its criteria for membership of the EU. The Copenhagen Criteria were a good start, but they need to be specified and applied to each country’s context.

This article arose from Soeren’s presentation at a UACES Arena seminar in Brussels on 17 December 2013. There were ~30 attendees at the event and the audience included representatives from EU Institutions, think tanks and pressure groups. Further info on UACES Arena Seminars at: www.uaces.org/arena
Territorialisation of Interest Representation in Times of Economic Crisis

Wrocław, 31 January – 1 February 2014

Formally launched with a panel at UACES 2013 and a one-day workshop at Queen’s University Belfast in October 2013, the Centrifugal Europe network ended its first year of events with the first annual conference. The conference gathered researchers from universities in Belfast, Cardiff, Groningen, Hong-Kong, Mannheim, Turin, Moscow, Warsaw and Wrocław.

The conference explored dynamics of interest representation in Europe in times of economic crisis. In an opening key-note address, Dariusz Adamski from the University of Wrocław suggested that the dominance of intergovernmentalist decision-taking in key policy fields has side-lined supranational institutions. This, he concluded his stimulating talk, has made the EU little more than a transmission belt for states’ specialist interest. As the current European crisis has brought concerns over interest representation and distributive conflicts to the surface at both state and sub-state level, it has also mobilised citizens who find it difficult to relate to European political, economic and societal integration. These were the foci of the first two panels. Contributors discussed the impact differentiated integration and side-lining of European publics in dealing with the economic crisis has on multilevel governance. Papers looked into reconfigurations of European level institutions, regional actors’ strategies to tap opportunities at EU level, citizens’ support for integration, and their mobilisation against it on the basis of territorially defined interests. In a commentary, it was concluded that interests are increasingly being defined territorially (nationally, regionally) exactly where state institutions fail to mediate public interests, respond to concerns, or provide rationales for integration.

The third panel presented preliminary results from the Eurolob II project (Mannheimer Zentrum für Europäische Sozialforschung MZES). Papers discussed criteria for interest representation at EU level deployed by the industry. They found territorial imbalances in industrial interest representation despite a general tendency towards Europeanization of economic interests in Germany, France, Poland and UK. The fourth panel on domestic and European implications of “reluctant German hegemony” contrasted the central role of Germany in times of crisis with constitutional and political expressions of euroscepticism in the country. Dimitry Kochenov’s (University of Groningen) closing talk addressed the concept of territoriality in EU legal texts. He focused on the abolition of borders, and therefore of territoriality, as the centrepiece of integration. The keynote highlighted tensions arising where territory is not defined, but produced through transgression of “prohibited borders”, such as in the field of European citizenship policies.

Overall the conference addressed important questions about the territorialisation of interest representation and distributive conflicts in the EU. While political actors question the existing political institutions at state and European level, the papers demonstrated that this contention is not accompanied by novel solutions to the problems faced by European societies in times of crisis. The network will continue to work on these questions with further events and publications in 2014 and 2015.

Further information: www.uaces.org/centrifugal

Upcoming Event - Regional Integration in Asia and Europe

Guangzhou, 13-14 March 2014

Regional integration has become an integral part of contemporary global politics: the EU fosters ties among its members as a solution to the on-going financial crisis; Europe has started talks with the US to set up a Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership; the Association of South East Asian Nations is taking steps to deepen integration among its members in a number of policy domains; China, Japan and Korea have concluded the first round of negotiations on a Free Trade Agreement while the US remains invested via the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation and the Trans-Pacific Partnership; at the same time, sub-state actors in both Asia and Europe are transforming into important foreign policy actors, too.

Further information: www.uaces.org/china

New CRN - Europe’s Return to United Nations Peacekeeping

This international collaborative research network will bring together an alliance of leading EU and US think tanks in order to examine the core challenges, opportunities and ways ahead for the European Union and a select number of European countries’ efforts to intensify their efforts within the United Nations Peacekeeping system.

The overall aim is to provide comprehensive analysis as well as actionable and timely advice on the main challenges and concrete ways ahead for overcoming institutional, political and military obstacles (both at European capitals and within the UN system) on the path towards a stronger re-engagement of European countries in the field of UN Peacekeeping.
Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) Strategy: Priorities and Problems

Maastricht, 31 January 2014

Nearly forty people took part in this second workshop organised by the network, from all over Europe (and from as far afield as Australia). The event started with a lively panel on regional priorities for CSDP covering China (Claude Zanardi), Asia more generally (Rhys Merrett), the Middle East (Patrick Müller) and the need for a maritime strategy (Michael E Smith). The questions posed were about where the EU could intervene most fruitfully and how it could play to its own needs and strengths.

The second panel considered priority issues from drones (Ana Juncos) to cyber-security (André Barrinha/Helena Carrapiço) and from climate change (Rafaela Brito) to the crime-terror nexus (Daniela Irrera). Here the debate was future-orientated as rather than dwelling on past missions or current dilemmas, the panellists all tried to address challenges emerging from technological developments and emerging crises and how these would impact the CSDP.

After a delicious vegetarian lunch (much to the horror of one Belgian delegate), the third panel addressed existing cross-cutting institutional problems such as the missing links between the new EU delegations and CSDP missions (Hans Merket), selective engagement (Niklas Novaky) and the question of whether bureaucratic incrementalism would advance the CSDP further than grand strategy (Simon Sweeney). The workshop concluded with an animated Round Table on first reactions to the December 2013 ‘defence summit’. Perspectives from the EU institutions were given by Bert Versmessen (EEAS) and Graham Muir (EDA), while Sophie Vanhoonacker from Maastricht and Simon Duke (EIPA) gave more sceptical reactions. Predictably, a lively debate ensued, which continued over drinks and dinner.

Further information: www.uaces.org/csdp

New CRN - Fringe Politics in Southeast Europe

Post-authoritarian transition in Southeast Europe (SEE) has proved particularly challenging for the consolidation of formal democratic politics and to the liberal transformation of the successor states, especially the post-conflict territories in Former Yugoslavia. The territories in the region span the spectrum of EU integration, from long-standing post-authoritarian Member States (Greece) and more recent post-socialist expansion of the EU (Slovenia, Croatia, Bulgaria, and Romania), to candidates and potential candidates in the Western Balkans (Bosnia, Macedonia, Montenegro, Kosovo, Albania, and Serbia).

Our network brings together several strands of politics ‘at the margins’ in SEE that have been largely overlooked by researchers examining the region, which include: war veterans’ groups in ex-Yugoslavia; Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender (LGBT) activism; anti-austerity and anti-corruption protests; protests for the right to public spaces; football fan groups (‘hooliganism’); far right ‘extremism’; Islamism; and fringe right- and left-wing political parties.

Further information: www.uaces.org/fringe

CRN funding: applications invited

Applications are now invited for the next round of CRN funding.

Application Deadline: 1 December 2014

For further information: www.uaces.org/networks

The Journal of Contemporary European Research is an open-access, online journal published by UACES in association with the Student Forum.

A selection of recent articles:

EU Soft Power and the Capability-Expectations Gap by Kristian L Nielsen
www.uaces.org/479/jcer

The Power of Economic Ideas: A Constructivist Political Economy of EU Trade Policy by Gabriel Siles-Brügge
www.uaces.org/437/jcer

Could and Should Britain have Joined the European Exchange Rate Mechanism in 1979? A Personal Memoir by Michael Franklin
www.uaces.org/604/jcer
Student Forum Seminars 2013

London, 21-22 November 2013

Rachael Dickson and Viviane Gravey report on this event which delivered tips and training to European Studies PhD students

Day 1

Viviane Gravey

“Publish or perish” – as PhD students we’ve all heard that phrase, yet we often lack the tools to act on it and publish during our PhD. The first day offered a crash course in academic and non-academic publishing – acknowledging the difficulties of each processes, but offering advice on how to overcome them.

The day opened with a discussion of what constitutes a good article. Christopher Bickerton from Cambridge stressed that developing your ideas and style as a writer took time and required support. Simona Guerra (University of Leicester) contended that articles should be written from scratch (not be a chapter of your monograph) – for example applying your theory to a new case or writing with a co-author. In the second session, Maxine David (University of Surrey) argued you should choose your target journal carefully (before writing the article) and that students should talk with editors at academic conferences. If your paper is not rejected as 70 to 95% proposals are, you will have to make revisions. In a third panel Paul Taggart of the University of Sussex stressed how the revision process was an opportunity to work with the editors to make your article better – but that as the author you could seldom incorporate all suggestions made by reviewers and you had to justify your choice.

After lunch, we talked of publishing outside academic journals. Andreas Müllerleile from ECFR and David Galbreath from the University of Bath provided advice on how to develop a professional online presence as an academic – from blogging to tweeting. But they stressed that not all institutions value their staff’s online presence. In the final session on publishing monographs, Toni Haastrup (University of Kent) presented on how she had changed her thesis into a book: changing case studies, positioning her work in a new literature and rethinking her contribution to the field – a significant amount of additional work.

Day 2

Rachael Dickson

The second day of the seminars focused on PhD skills. It was a great opportunity to fulfil training requirements with the focus clearly on our subject area of European Studies. The atmosphere was relaxed and friendly, with everyone now well acquainted from drinks the night before.

The Student Forum Committee led the first two sessions. Lena Sucker and Francesca Batzella provided invaluable advice for conducting fieldwork; highlighting the benefits of undertaking interviews as well as practical advice on how to organise and facilitate them. In the second session, Kathryn Simpson and Grant Stirling discussed the role of academic conferences, showing how they are not only useful for career development but also for receiving feedback on your work as it is in progress.

After coffee, Karolina Pomorska and Giacomo Orsini presented on ‘Applying for grants and funding’. Both shared their experiences of securing sought-after funds; Giacomo specifically throughout his PhD and Karolina of her post-PhD experience. The second session, led by Steven Curtis of the Higher Education Academy, addressed skills for postgraduate teachers. Steven provided advice for those finding it difficult to obtain teaching positions and showed a number of creative ways this CV requirement can be obtained.

The Student Forum Elections took place after lunch. Five candidates presented themselves for election to the committee. Each provided a statement about themselves and those in attendance then cast their ballots. The result was announced in early December and both Viviane and I would like to express our gratitude to those who elected us to the committee and look forward to working with the other members over the coming year.

The final, and most thought-provoking, session of the day looked at the future of research on the EU in relation to the open access debate. Three speakers addressed the floor from publishing (Caroline Wintersgill), academic (Giacomo Benedetto) and research backgrounds (Ellen Collins). It addressed much of the speculation being made with regards to open access.

New Members Elected

UACES is pleased to welcome two new members to the Student Forum committee.

Rachael DICKSON is studying at Queen’s University Belfast. Her PhD focuses on the area of European Union external governance in the field of human rights. She is looking forward to working with the Student Forum to provide support for young researchers.

Viviane GRAVEY is a PhD researcher at the University of East Anglia. She studies the evolution of EU environmental policy since the early 1990s. As part of the UACES Student Forum committee she will coordinate the Euroresearch list.
UACES Scholars 2014

UACES would like to congratulate the successful students who will be receiving UACES Scholarships this year.

**Florian Edelmann**
Aberystwyth University
PhD Research Topic
Political violence and terrorism in Europe in comparative perspective

**Ioanna Ntampoudi**
Aston University
PhD Research Topic
National and European Identities During the Eurozone Crisis: The Case of Greece

**Eske Van Gils**
University of Kent
PhD Research Topic
EU democracy promotion policies towards Belarus and Azerbaijan

European Diplomacy post-Westphalia and the European External Action Service: Taking Stock and Looking Forward

London, 19-20 November 2013

David Spence, London School of Economics and Political Science

The outgoing David Davies of Llandinam Research Fellow (Mr. David Spence) hosted this event which took place at the London offices of the European Commission Representation in the UK. It was the second in a two-part conference series exploring the nature of modern diplomacy, and the specificity of the EU as an actor on the stage of international diplomacy.

The Taking Stock event also had the specific aim of refining the forthcoming book on the nature and evolution of European diplomacy in the post-Westphalian era, with a special focus on the European External Action Service (EEAS).

Speakers presented their draft chapters, inviting comments from their fellow presenters as well as questions from the audience. The presentations covered a wide range of themes, such as the legal, institutional and governance dynamics of EU diplomacy in general and the EEAS in particular. Practical aspects were also considered, including diplomatic training, recruitment and staffing practices within the EU diplomatic structures.

The conference brought together practitioners, the think-tank community, academics, students and informed members of the public for two days of fruitful discussion and networking. The presenters and discussants were leading experts in their respective fields. Ramses Wessel spoke about the legal competences of the EEAS. Simon Duke presented experience in diplomatic training, Mai’a Davis Cross elaborated on the EEAS’ public diplomacy role, while seasoned practitioners like Alison Weston of the EU Military Staff provided her insider perspective on the EEAS crisis management capabilities, and Lars-Erik Lundin, formerly Head of the EU delegation to the international organisations in Vienna, shared his direct experience in crafting effective multilateralism. Academics such as Michael H. Smith (Loughborough University) and Geoffrey Edwards (Cambridge University) acted as discussants, while Hugo Shorter, Head of Europe Directorate, at the UK Foreign and Commonwealth Office, concluded the two days’ discussions by providing an overview of and the thinking behind the recently released UK government’s Review of EU competences.

There was a substantial representation of FCO delegates in the audience, as well as attendance by a number of political counsellors representing various EU member states’ embassies in London. The timing of the event was particularly fortuitous, as it closely followed the publication of the Competences Review and provided a forum for constructive discussions of the wider issues surrounding the UK’s relationship with the EU, as well as concentrating minds on the development of the unique and crucial actor in modern diplomacy that is the European External Action Service. All together, the conference drew 60 participants, and served as a useful networking tool for the international community studying, researching and working within the diplomatic structures of the European Union.
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Same aims, different approaches?
Recent EU and US free trade agreements in Asia

Maria Garcia, University of Bath

Over the past two decades preferential and free trade agreements (FTAs) have proliferated around the globe. FTAs differ in the level of liberalization they commit to, and the scope of economic sectors brought into the agreement. Asian FTAs tend to be ‘shallow’, that is, they reinforce commitments already taken at the WTO and lower tariffs on a few products. By contrast, EU and USA FTAs, incorporate ‘deep’ trade issues (elimination of behind the border obstacles to trade in the form of regulations, harmonizing competition policy, liberalizing trade in services, opening public procurement to foreigners, and tightening intellectual property rights). Both the EU and USA seek to establish themselves as norm-setters in their FTAs, given that developing states’ opposition to ‘deep’ trade at the WTO led to the decision at the 2005 Hong Kong WTO Ministerial Meeting to drop these controversial matters from the negotiation agenda and concentrate on trade facilitation.

Evident in both approaches to FTAs are the following: political motivations of maintaining and extending their preferred regulatory system and gradually defeating opposition to this; long-term economic objectives of securing advantages to certain economic sectors from more open markets and markets adapted to their standards and regulations.

The degree of similarity between EU and USA agreements is due to various factors:

i. The EU and USA pursue similar broad strategic objectives in FTAs.

ii. Much of the content of FTAs is already determined by the WTO regime, and GATT Article 24 which allows for the creation of preferential trade agreements. This establishes that FTAs must encompass the near totally of trade flows between partners.

iii. In most cases, FTA partners will have similar defensive and offensive positions in negotiations vis-à-vis both the EU and USA (e.g. maintaining domestic government procurement protected from foreign bidders), and similar ‘red lines’ in the negotiation (e.g. South Korea’s position on automobiles).

iv. Desire to open more significant markets and stay on a par with one another (Hence, the similar network of FTAs, see Table 1).

Differences in the EU and USA FTAs in Asia are determined by their domestic settings and policy priorities. USA chapters on service liberalization include audiovisual services, which the EU rejects to ensure cultural diversity. EU FTAs, like the recently signed FTA with Singapore, liberalize trade in green technology equipment and environmental services, sectors in which European firms are highly competitive. The USA approach to standard divergence tends to seek mutual recognition solutions, as it did by negotiating a high quota for USA cars to enter Korea using USA safety standards. By contrast, the EU aims at the acceptance of international standards that it uses (UN Economic Committee for Europe car safety standards) and the institutionalization of procedures for joint standard setting as it does in the FTA with Korea. Until the FTA with Singapore, EU FTAs lacked an investment protection chapter, as the European Commission was only vested with competences over investment negotiations in the Lisbon Treaty.

### Table 1: United States and European Union Free Trade Agreements in Asia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Conclude</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Conclude</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>USA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>European Union</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASEAN</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Suspended in 2006 after</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Suspended in 2010</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trans-Pacific Partnership 2013</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2012 (March)</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2011 (July)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Negotiating Framework Agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Trans-Pacific Partnership</td>
<td>Negotiating Framework Agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) negotiations with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: European Commission DG Trade website, US Trade Representative website (2013)
Promoting Gender Equality Abroad: An Assessment of EU Action in the External Dimension

Graz, 28-29 November 2013

Larissa Ogertschnig, University of Graz

This conference was organized by the Russian East-European & Eurasian Studies Centre (REEES), in cooperation with the Centre for Southeast Studies (CSEE), the European Training and Research Centre for Human Rights and Democracy (UNI-ETC), and the Institute of Public Law of the University of Graz. It responded to a perceived lack of coordinated activities by researchers throughout Europe and beyond, who focus on aspects of EU gender equality promotion in the external dimension.

The twelve papers formed part of four broad clusters. Cluster One aimed at conceptualizing gender and gender equality in EU external action and thereby constituted the basis for the geographically or thematically more specific papers of the following sections. Cluster Two consisted of three presentations on EU action in different world regions, in particular Latin America, Sub-Saharan Africa, and Central Asia, exposing similarities as well as differences in EU approaches. The following four papers shed light on the role of the Union in promoting gender equality during the EU accession process. The final three papers concentrated on the role of gender equality promotion in various other external policies of the EU, in particular climate change and trade policy. A critical analysis of the core EU tools of gender equality promotion, in particular mainstreaming and assistance, formed part of most papers. While some presenters addressed gender themes more generally, others chose to focus on specific themes, like violence against women.

The conference benefited strongly from the diverse backgrounds of the participants and their common interest in interdisciplinary work. Presenters were at various stages of their professional career, represented various academic disciplines, including Gender Studies, Sociology, Geography, European Studies, Political Science, and Law, and often had ample experience in the countries or regions analysed. The conference was open to the public and was attended by students and academics.

It is planned to publish the finalised versions of the paper in an edited volume and to continue cooperation in various formats.

Small Event grants: proposals invited

Up to 1,000 GBP is available to support one-off events.

Application deadline: 16 May 2014

Further info: www.uaces.org/small

Do you have a view on the points raised in this article? Then why not share it on the UACES blog, where this article has been republished.

www.uaces.org/7808

Intellectual Property rights (IPR), in particular the protection of Geographic Indicators (GIs), which denote products associated with a specific location (e.g. Champagne, Parma ham), is an area where the different regulatory approaches in the EU and USA have obfuscated attempts to create an international system at the WTO. The EU’s GI register grants automatic protection for GIs. In the USA, GIs are protected through trademarks, and it is possible to register a trademark with a GI which is not connected to the location. In its FTA with Korea, however, a novel solution was reached. Singapore created new IPR legislation in the early 2000s, based on USA IPRs, including GI trademarks, which would be compatible with the high IPR protection that the USA-Singapore FTA demanded. Singapore has agreed to create its own GI register system to which EU GI holders must submit requests for registration and protection, rather than grant automatic protection to a list of GIs, which would infringe its domestic IPR laws. Although the EU insists this is not a precedent, it could point to a possible solution to EU-USA regulatory divergence, which is the stated aim of Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) negotiations.

What else can recent agreements with Asia reveal about the complexities of the TTIP and the potential for exportability of regulatory solutions in European and American agreements in Asia to the TTIP? The differences in IPR protection are represented by those issues which decades of EU-USA cooperation have failed to resolve and the most challenging issues for TTIP. Despite the political will behind TTIP, this will represent a more symmetrical negotiation in terms of the parties than any FTA negotiation, where it will be impossible for each of the parties to impose their models and solutions. This will lead to a re-design of their past practices, with a focus on joint regulation in future areas.
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Update on Cork Annual Conference
Thank you to everyone who submitted a paper proposal for the upcoming Annual Conference in Cork in September. The CIP was very successful, with well over 500 proposals, and the growing internationalisation of UACES was evident.

To give you a small snapshot, we received proposals from individuals based at 270 different institutions spread across 47 different countries, with only 33% originating from the UK.

The research programme will be released in March and the paper abstracts will be available online.

Call for Editors - JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies
UACES and Wiley invite applications for the role of Editors of the JCMS.

We are seeking to appoint an interdisciplinary editorial team of senior scholars of international standing, that have clear strategic objectives and a credible delivery plan for their realisation.

The Journal is the leading interdisciplinary, international journal for research and scholarship in the field of European integration. It covers the full range of EU activities, as well as theoretical aspects of integration including comparative regionalism. The main disciplinary focus of the Journal is on political science and economics, but with important contributions from a range of other disciplines such as law, social policy and history.

The current Editors have recently celebrated the Journal’s 50th anniversary by organising a series of events, including a special anniversary lecture given by Jacques Delors. They have introduced the use of article-by-article online publication (EarlyView), reduced the wait time from acceptance to publication, streamlined the publication process, and increased the two-year impact factor to 1.603. In a given year JCMS publishes six issues plus the Annual Review.

The new Editorial team would commence work in January 2015.

Further information: www.uaces.org/jcmscall

The deadline for applications is Friday 9 May 2014.
Appointments and Awards

Alberto ALEMANNO has been appointed Global Clinical Professor at New York University School of Law and Faculty Director of the NYU-HEC EU Regulatory Policy Clinic.

Dimitris BOURIS was selected as the Routledge Politics & International Relations Author of the Month for February [read the interview at www.uaces.org/7804].

Michelle CINI was awarded the Pierre Keller Visiting Professorship at the Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.

Henri DE WAELE has been appointed Professor of International and European Law at the Radboud University Nijmegen.

Maria GARCIA has been appointed Senior Lecturer at the University of Bath.

Toni HAASTRUP has been appointed Lecturer in International Security at the University of Kent.

Miguel OTERO has been appointed Senior Analyst in the European Economy and Emerging Markets at the Elcano Royal Institute, Madrid.

Michelle PACE has been appointed Professor with special responsibilities at the Dept of Society and Globalisation, Roskilde University.

John RYAN has been appointed Research Associate at the Von Hügel Institute of St Edmund's College, University of Cambridge.

Oana STEFAN has been appointed Senior Lecturer in EU and Public Law at King's College London.

Elections

In 2014, for the first time, the UACES Committee elections will be conducted electronically.

The election will be run for us by an independent organisation called Electoral Reform Services. They will be emailing the ‘ballot papers’ to all eligible voters in the second half of March. There will be a 4 week voting window, with the provisional voting deadline being 15 April.

Finally, we do have a few members that do not use email; provision has been made to send them election material by post.

Innovation in Teaching Europe

HEC Paris has launched one of the first Massive Open Online Courses (MOOC) on the European Union. The course, which runs from February until early April, is called ‘Understanding Europe - Why it Matters and What it Can Offer You’. Throughout the course, participants are confronted with real-life examples of EU action. EU affairs professionals share their personal EU experiences and tell participants about their jobs.

Further information: www.uaces.org/7805

Central Library of the Council of the EU

The library has recently been opening up its resources to research communities. Its main collection focuses on politics and institutional developments in the EU and Member States, neighbouring and partner countries. It has a reading room with press and academic journals from all Member States. One of their more recent initiatives is the creation of an online bibliography on the role and history of the European Council and the Council of the EU.

Further information: www.uaces.org/7803

The Journal of Contemporary European Studies invites new submissions

JCER is an open access, online Journal now published four times a year by UACES in association with the UACES Student Forum. JCER publishes general and special issues comprising research articles, commentaries, practitioner reflections and book reviews. It provides a publication outlet for a full range of scholars, enabling PhD students and early career researchers to disseminate their work alongside established scholars.

The journal is peer-reviewed and publishes research on a diverse range of disciplines, including but not limited to European politics, economics, law, history, geography, culture and arts, and science. We seek to stimulate wide-ranging discussion on inter-disciplinary and cross-national perspectives, and particularly welcome contributions that debate the relevance of Europe beyond its own geographical and cultural space.

New Editors were appointed in late 2012. Under their management, some changes and initiatives have been introduced.

• The publication timeline has gradually reduced and from 2014, JCER aims to publish articles within 6-12 months from the original date of submission;
• An annual competition will be held for Special Issues;
• Research on Teaching and Learning will be promoted in a new special section;
• The submission of non-traditional articles from the practitioner community is encouraged;
• A new editorial board has been established.

To submit an article for consideration, you must do so online. Go to www.uaces.org/submit where you will find further instructions and the Author Guidelines. If you are a new user, you must first register as an Author. Once you have completed this step and are logged in, a New Submission link becomes visible.

www.jcer.net
In November, we published a list of new Jean Monnet Centres of Excellence. Embarrassingly, missing from the list was one of our own Group members. We are obviously pleased to be able to correct this error by publishing the profile of the new Centre below.

**Study of Transnational Europe**

The University of Portsmouth has been recognised as a Jean Monnet Centre of Excellence.

The new Centre, entitled the JM Centre of Excellence for the Study of Transnational Europe (CESTE), encompasses the work of researchers in the Centre for European and International Studies Research (CEISR) that achieved a 5 star rating in the 2008 REF, together with the innovative University teaching/learning portfolio offered in the field of EU studies. CESTE will focus on the notion of a trans-national Europe, exploring in three research projects and other activities, the processes and practices of societal, cultural and political trans-nationalisation within and outside the EU.

The first of these projects seeks to explore the changing role of experts in the policy-making processes and the changing nature of that expertise. The second will address trans-national dimensions of the EU’s external policies and notions of European Identity in strengthening relations with Eastern partner and ENP countries. The third project explores the trans-national negotiation of narratives and memory in the EU.

Other planned CESTE activities include the development of open access online EU modules, and the development of closer local/regional association with the University through Southern England Local Partners.

Further information: www.port.ac.uk/ceste

**Are MOOCs the future?**

Stephen Caddick, Vice-Provost for Enterprise at University College London, writes about MOOCs and the ‘personalised’ university of the future on the Policy Review website.

Further information: www.uaces.org/7806

**Erasmus+**

Erasmus+ is the new EU funding programme which incorporates the Lifelong Learning Programme and Jean Monnet activities. Hopefully, many of you have already discovered this programme, and the funding opportunities that are on offer. The deadline to apply is 26 March 2014.

Of particular interest are the funding streams for Jean Monnet Networks and Jean Monnet Projects.

Jean Monnet Network funding is to support the creation and development of consortia comprising five or more institutions in the area of European Union studies which contribute to gathering information, exchanging practices, building knowledge and promoting the European Integration process across the world. On offer is 300,000 EUR spread over 3 years.

Jean Monnet Project funding is to explore how European Union studies can be made more attractive by testing new methodologies, pedagogical content and tools for delivery, increasing the knowledge about EU studies in other faculties and supporting information activities for the staff of public administrations and civil society. On offer is 60,000 EUR for projects of 1-2 years duration.

Further information: www.uaces.org/7801

**Exploring EU Foreign Policy**

An online guide for researchers, students and practitioners which presents key information sources on EU foreign policy. The guide includes academic literature, links to EU sources and documents, and links to sources of other international organizations, NGO’s and think tanks.

Further information: www.eufp.eu

**Think Tank Review**

The Central Library of the EU now compiles a monthly (well, almost) Think Tank Review, rounding up all the material published by the various think tanks in Brussels in the preceding month. You can read the review on their website, or subscribe to a dedicated mailing list.

Further information: www.uaces.org/7802

Next Copy Deadline: 1 June 2014

Submissions are particularly welcome for the Events Diary, Recent Books and News sections.

Please send to admin@uaces.org and include high resolution images where possible.
**Eastern Enlargement Ten Years On: Transcending the East-West Divide?**

Edited by Rachel A Epstein (University of Denver) and Wade Jacoby (Brigham Young University), this Special Issue of JCMS is available online as an open access issue for the remainder of 2014.

The volume reaches three surprising conclusions: since 2004, the EU’s economic effects have been more far-reaching than its political effects; all of the new Member States have had problems with democratic consolidation; and, despite four years of intense crisis in the eurozone, both the EU’s enlargement and neighbourhood-shaping efforts have continued.

Articles in the issue include:

- Overcoming ‘Economic Backwardness’ in the European Union by Rachel A Epstein
- The Role of the EU in Shaping FDI Flows to East Central Europe by Gergő Medve-Bálint
- The EU Factor in Fat Times and in Lean: Did the EU Amplify the Boom and Soften the Bust? By Wade Jacoby
- Money, Margins and the Motors of Politics: The EU and the Development of Party Politics in Central and Eastern Europe by Tim Haughton
- The Political Economy of State Capture in Central Europe by Abby Innes
- Anchoring Democracy from Above? The European Union and Democratic Backsliding in Hungary and Romania after Accession by Ulrich Sedelmeier
- EU Leverage and National Interests in the Balkans: The Puzzles of Enlargement Ten Years On by Milada Anna Vachudova
- European Union Governance towards the Eastern Neighbourhood: Transcending or Redrawing Europe’s East – West Divide? by Julia Langbein

Further information: www.uaces.org/jcms521

---

**Routledge - UACES Contemporary European Studies book series**

Selected titles from the CES series are now available in paperback...

- European Union Intergovernmental Conferences by Paul W Thurner and Franz Urban Pappi
  - ISBN: 978-0415456609

- Minority Nationalist Parties and European Integration by Anwen Elias
  - ISBN: 978-0415468039

- The Political Economy of State-Business Relations in Europe by Rainer Eising
  - ISBN: 978-0415465076

- The European Union as a Leader in International Climate Change Politics by Rüdiger Wurzel and James Connelly (eds)
  - ISBN: 978-0415580472

All Routledge-UACES titles are available to UACES Individual and Student members for the special discount price of **£25.00**.

New proposals and discussions of future proposals, are welcome. Series Editors: Federica Bicchi, Tanja Börzel and Mark Pollack.

In both cases visit: www.uaces.org/ces