Europe’s Brexit Question

Tim Oliver, Royal Military Academy Sandhurst

Focusing on what a Brexit could mean for Britain overlooks the more important question of what it could mean for Europe.

Scan any newspaper article, click on any blog post or read any academic paper on the subject of Britain leaving the EU and you’ll find the focus is on what it would mean for Britain and whether or not it will happen. This seems logical enough, but it leaves a gaping hole in the analysis.

Discussing a Brexit should also be a discussion about Europe and what European integration would mean if the people of one of the largest European states – a state that is a core part of European identity, politics, economics, culture and power – democratically voted to quit the leading organisation for pan-European cooperation and unity. That would not be an insignificant moment in the history of the EU.

Discussing the withdrawal of any member state is a taboo. Holding an in-out referendum – not on a treaty, the Euro, or on joining the EU, but on whether to stay or go – itself breaks new ground irrespective of the result. It challenges the idea of ‘ever closer union’.

To be fair, Europe currently has to face the more immediate question of a possible Grexit. It might also appear to play to David Cameron’s plan (should he win the May 2015 UK general election) to seek a renegotiated UK-EU relationship, a plan that rests on the leverage of a Brexit.

continued on page 3
**Labour Standards and Sustainable Development: Unpicking the EU’s Approach**

London, 17 October 2014

**Rebecca Zahn, University of Stirling**

This one-day conference brought together nine speakers from different academic disciplines, the European Parliament, the International Trade Union Confederation and civil society organisations to consider the EU’s role in the promotion of successful sustainable development in the sphere of labour standards through its external actions. The event was convened by Rebecca Zahn (University of Stirling) and David Mangan (University of Leicester), with financial support from UACES, the Society of Legal Scholars, the University of Stirling and the University of Bristol.

The conference aimed to unpick the EU’s sustainable development policies in the area of labour standards by encouraging a debate between academics and policy makers. Following a keynote address by Tonia Novitz (University of Bristol) which set out the EU’s competence in the sphere of sustainable development, a number of academic speakers from law and the social sciences considered the topic of sustainable development within its broader legal, social and political contexts. A panel of policymakers then considered how such academic debates play out in ‘practice’. What became increasingly obvious during the day were not only the broad discrepancies between theory and practice but also the difficulties encountered within an EU context to combine sustainability and competitiveness.

The conference which was very well received was attended by over thirty participants and included representatives from academia (ranging from PhD students to established academics), the International Labour Organisation and various think tanks.

Following on from the conference we have created a number of lecture slides and podcasts (available on the conference website: www.uaces.org/8101) which introduce the topic of sustainable development and summarise the conference proceedings. We also plan to publish a selection of the papers and, in the long term, hope to continue the debate between policymakers and academics over the EU’s role in promoting sustainable development in the area of labour standards.
continuing from page 1

Yet decision makers have already grappled in some way with the Brexit question. While lots of member states could hold referendums that would wreak havoc on any new EU treaty, it is the possibility of a British one being an in-out vote that has given a greater pause for thought than most.

What nobody is spending any significant time doing when they pause to think is asking whether or not it would be a good or bad thing for the EU to lose the UK. To borrow from President Lyndon Johnson: is it better to have the UK inside the EU tent pissing out, or outside the EU tent pissing in? There is next to no publicly available detailed analysis to guide us towards an answer.

This does not mean that politicians from elsewhere in the EU should wade into the UK’s debate, a move that could inflame feelings in the UK of EU interference. But on what are they or anybody else basing their comments, decisions and analysis about how to approach the possibility of a Brexit? Ed Miliband, the leader of the UK’s Labour Party, warned that the UK risks sleepwalking out of the EU. The EU itself risks being asleep as the UK sleeps out the door.

The academic literature offers only limited answers. There have been only a few in-depth attempts to analyse how European disintegration might happen. The assumption is that European integration is forward moving; that the EU is like a bicycle that must keep going forward to stay upright.

A Brexit would test many theories and ideas of what European integration means. It may be that if Britain retained a strong connection with the EU then the essential components of some theories would remain valid. Some might explain a Brexit as an interesting but irrelevant anomaly if the rest of the EU carried on integrating.

A Brexit could change the EU in a number of ways. The EU’s centre of power could shift further east, from larger to smaller states, from economically liberal and outward looking to more protectionist, interventionist states. It could strengthen the position of Germany, or leave Berlin economically isolated.

Losing the member often described as ‘an awkward partner’ could make it easier for the EU to work, or remind us that Britain is not the only state that can be awkward. Some fear a Brexit will unravel the EU by making other states question their commitment, but the same is said of Cameron’s desire to seek a renegotiated ‘a la carte’ relationship for Britain inside the EU.

Switzerland, Norway, Turkey or Ukraine could find their relationships with the EU reshaped by a new UK-EU relationship. The rest of the world may view the EU’s loss of one of its two serious military powers as a sign of Europe’s continued decline, division and weakness. Such geopolitical thinking will likely shape the views of a Brexit by powers such as the USA, Russia or China.

It is geopolitical thinking that will inevitably shape the views of the rest of the EU. The focus on Britain is a weakness of the Brexit debate. Start a debate on the topic of what a Brexit would mean for the EU and it inevitably turns to what it will mean for Britain. But this is a debate about Europe. It will be concerns about the knock-on effects across Europe that will guide the reaction of other EU states whether they are Germany, Finland or Slovenia. Bilateral trading, security or political links with the UK will be important, but decision makers across Europe will look at the wider picture as being a bigger concern.

The focus on Britain also means that debate in Britain overlooks how others might react to the wider ramifications of it leaving. Often stale and never ending arguments about what new relationship with the EU the UK should seek if it leaves ignores the fact that it will be for the rest of the EU – 27 member states and the European Parliament – to also agree to the new relationship.

Britain cannot just expect to get what is best for it. The British withdrawal debate is largely ignorant of a basic factor of any relationship: that it is a two-way process. What the rest of the EU agrees to will reflect the changed political makeup, outlook and interests of a post-Brexit EU.

It could be that there will be no referendum. It could be that even if there is one, the British people will vote to stay in. But Britain’s reputation as ‘an awkward partner’ is unlikely to disappear. Scotland’s independence referendum reminds us that a vote to stay in a union doesn’t mean commitment is settled. The possibility – along with the desirability or undesirability – of a Brexit could hang over the EU for a long time to come.

Tim Oliver is a lecturer in the Department of Defence and International Affairs at the Royal Military Academy Sandhurst and a non-resident fellow at the SAIS Center for Transatlantic Relations, Washington D.C. This article arose from Tim’s presentation at a UACES Arena seminar in Brussels on 20 January 2015. He writes here in a personal capacity.

Present your research at an Arena Seminar
The Arena Bursary provides the opportunity to present innovative research to an audience of Brussels-based policy makers.

Bursaries are worth up to 500 GBP each.

The next application deadline is 18 September 2015.

Further information: www.uaces.org/arena
Banking Regulation and Supervision and the Great Leap Forward in European Integration

Brussels, 13-14 November 2014

Aneta Spendzharova, Maastricht University

Hosted by the Brussels Campus of Maastricht University, this two-day workshop brought together researchers from the UK, US, Netherlands and Germany working on the European Banking Union as well as officials from the European Union institutions and policy experts. The event was co-organised by Aneta Spendzharova (Maastricht University), David Howarth (University of Luxembourg) and Huw Macartney (University of Birmingham). Participants discussed the latest developments in the supranationalisation of banking regulation and supervision in the European Union. In the space of six years, we have witnessed a ‘great leap forward’ for European integration marked by the adoption of over a dozen pieces of EU legislation shaping the operation of banks, from new rules on bank capital, to reconfigured EU supervisory agencies, to a range of policy proposals associated with the European Banking Union. These measures constitute the most dramatic transfer of policymaking powers to the European level since the start of Economic and Monetary Union in 1999.

The supranationalisation of European banking sector supervision necessitated a loss of national sovereignty. One of the central aims of the workshop was to investigate systematically the preferences of EU member states such as the UK, France, Germany, Italy, Sweden and the Baltic states during the negotiations of the European Banking Union. In addition, participants examined the implications of the banking union for the single market and cross-border banks in Europe. Some member states such as Germany, France and Italy take part in both the European Monetary Union (EMU) and the European Banking Union (EBU), while others such as the UK and Sweden have sent a clear signal that they intend to remain outside both the EMU and the EBU. This, in turn, creates regulatory frictions for large internationalised banks headquartered in EU member states outside the euro area.

Research Articles

The European External Action Service: Torn Apart Between Several Principals or Acting as a Smart ‘Double-agent’? by Thomas E Henökl
www.uaces.org/jcer605

Bottom-up Perspectives on Multilingual Ideologies in the EU: The Case of a Transnational NGO by Franco Zappettini, Ruxandra Comanaru
www.uaces.org/jcer580

The Populist Conception of Democracy beyond Popular Sovereignty by Pepijn Corduwener
www.uaces.org/jcer636

Teaching, Learning and the Profession

Teaching Qualitative Methods in Social Science: A Problem-based Learning Approach by Helene Dyrhauge
www.uaces.org/jcer649

The Use of Matching as a Study Choice Aid by Maastricht University’s Bachelor in European Studies: Facilitating Transition to Higher Education? by Patrick Bijmans, Pia Harbers
www.uaces.org/jcer646

The Future of European Studies: A Perspective from Ireland by Mary C Murphy
www.uaces.org/jcer645

Engagement as an Educational Objective by Charles Dannreuther
www.uaces.org/jcer654

European Studies and Public Engagement: A Conceptual Toolbox by Andreas Müllerleile
www.uaces.org/jcer647

Book Reviews

The EU’s Foreign Policy: What Kind of Power and Diplomatic Action? www.uaces.org/jcer611

Russian Energy Security and Foreign Policy www.uaces.org/jcer652

Teaching Politics and International Relations www.uaces.org/jcer657
Why European Populists Support Putin’s Russia (...And Why It Matters)

Brussels, 3 December 2014

Angelos-Stylianos Chryssogelos, University of Limerick

This UACES Arena seminar touched upon a topic whose policy relevance increased substantially in the previous year but which had received scant attention in academic and media debates: the links developed between Vladimir Putin’s regime in Russia, and populist and radical parties in the European Union. At the height of the Ukraine crisis, these parties became the most reliable exponents of the Kremlin’s points of view in their respective political settings. The presentation and subsequent contributions by discussants Tunne Kelam (MEP-EPP) and Peter Kreko (Political Capital Institute) generated interesting insights into how two major challenges to today’s Europe, one internal (populism) and one external (Putin’s Russia), interact and reinforce each other.

The implications of this argument are quite far-reaching. Rather than dismissing Putin’s appeal in Europe as something confined to the ideological fringes (especially of the far right, as most journalistic accounts do), highlighting populism as the main link between radicals and Eurosceptics of all stripes, as well as between them and Russia, means acknowledging the allure of populism in Europe as a potent ideological alternative to the rules-based multi-level governance which has characterized European integration. Putin’s forceful foreign policy, as exhibited in Ukraine, presents a real-life alternative to the liberal European and global orders that all populists (despite different ideological origins and justifications) are uncomfortable with.

The argument presented also called into question the optimism associated with EU ‘normative’ foreign policy and how it is supposed to reflect the European project domestically, thus legitimizing it. The EU’s encounters with populist and semi-authoritarian leaders abroad can actually further strengthen existing political divides at home between mainstream and populist parties. Just as rules-based governance at home was meant to be legitimized through an active promotion of European ‘values’ internationally, populists are equally capable of underlining their opposition to these norms and values by way of foreign policy debates and crises. In this way, this presentation endeavoured to show that, far from being a fringe phenomenon associated with discredited radical ideas, the populism-Russia nexus represents a formidable challenge to the legitimacy of the EU both as a system of governance and a foreign policy actor.

Angelos-Stylianos Chryssogelos is a Lecturer in European Politics at the Department of Politics and Public Administration of the University of Limerick. From February 2015 he will be an Academy Senior Fellow at Chatham House in London. This article arose from his presentation at a UACES Arena seminar in Brussels on 3 December 2014. 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
Student Forum Seminars 2014: Teaching European Studies

London, Monday 17 November

This event focused on the skills required to successfully teach at an undergraduate level. Sessions were a mix of traditional and more practical workshops. There was a particular emphasis on the challenges encountered when teaching European Studies. More than 70 students from across Europe participated in the event.

Challenges of Teaching European Studies

Viviane Gravey

The first session at this year’s Student Forum Seminars looked at the challenges of teaching European Studies. Prior to the seminar, participants were invited to fill in a survey identifying key challenges to teaching EU studies, either linked to teaching as a PhD student or to teaching the EU compared to other subjects. In response to the survey, Robert Ackrill from Nottingham Trent University began with a presentation on research-informed teaching as a solution to a number of teaching challenges. Examples he gave of how this might be applied included bringing current pieces of research into the syllabus to remain relevant, bringing one’s own research in to demonstrate interests in the subject taught – if students feel that you find the subject dull, they will quickly notice – and integrating student-led, student-centred research activities to foster students’ role as producers, not consumers, of knowledge. Afterwards, he reacted to specific issues raised in the survey and in the discussion with seminar participants. Regarding how to introduce undergraduate students to the EU, he argued for conveying the essence of complex mechanisms, not their complete details, and to challenge head-on anti-EU sentiment, inviting students to question media coverage of EU affairs. Further discussions on teaching skills showcased the variety of experiences among PhD students present regarding the volume of teaching expected of them, the number of students per class and how their prior knowledge of the EU differed. While Robert Ackrill argued there is no perfect lecture or seminar, he pointed to useful teaching tactics such as case studies teaching, splitting students in smaller groups and the importance of real-life experience such as field trips to Brussels.

Making Simulations Work

Kathryn Simson

Chris Goldsmith from De Montfort University conducted a fascinating, timely and insightful second session on ‘Making Simulations Work’ dismissing the notion that academic researchers continue to work in ivory towers away from the real world. Research, teaching and higher education has evolved and as a result of this many academic researchers are using a variety of techniques, including simulations to create a learning environment which is practical, effective and participatory for students.

Chris followed his own advice which is to begin with a simple simulation. The students played the game Rock, Paper, Scissors using a deck of playing cards as a reward. Negotiating the rules of the game led to different outcomes and was a simple and effective way to demonstrate the dynamic and influence of power. In terms of pedagogy, a simulation gives students an alternative way to get involved and provides a different way of assessing what students have learned. The use of a simulation can provide knowledge and insight and allow both students and academic researchers to think about skills and understandings within and beyond the use of the simulation itself: skills that are needed and executed in all aspects of professional life.

So how do you design a simulation? The following are some key questions and pointers to consider for anyone wanting to incorporate a simulation into their teaching:

Teaching Goals - What are your goals as a teacher? Do you want to examine substantive knowledge about a specific process? Or are you interested in the skills students demonstrate?

Learning Environment - Do you want students to learn in a community? Do you want to engage in or create a space where you as the teacher are part of the group?

Assessment - When assessing your simulation, the assessment should align with the learning goals set out in the course syllabus.

Debrief & Evaluation - A key part of any simulation. What strategies did the students use and how did they work out? Was the simulation successful or not? It’s important for students to feel confident in critiquing their own performance as well.

Constraints - Think about and acknowledge practical issues such as room availability, resources, planning etc. Furthermore students are no guinea pigs, so show attention and care towards students as individuals and be honest about your innovation!

All in all, a fascinating and rewarding session which will without a doubt see many PhD researchers carefully think in an innovative manner about their teaching style and their own research.
Using the Internet for Teaching Purposes

Viviane Gravey

The third session focused on e-learning and social media as teaching tools. First off, Alexandra Mihai from the Vrije Universiteit Brussel presented her experience of e-learning at the Institute for European Studies. She described e-learning as composed of both asynchronous and synchronous components, and suggested they worked better when mixed. Thus, asynchronous methods offer comprehensiveness and flexibility – as students access a great number of materials in their own chosen time and place – but they require self-discipline and may lead to a feeling of isolation. To address these issues, synchronous methods such as online seminars, instant chat or virtual office hours could help. Yet this also raises challenges as student-teacher interaction modes are very different if online – due to the lack of non-verbal cues, the difficulties for group coordination etc. In conclusion she stressed the need to adapt the content and format to the audience, for digital literacy on behalf of the teacher, and the importance of communication with participants, before, during and after e-learning.

The second speaker, Sarah Lieberman from Canterbury Christ Church University related her experience of using Facebook as a teaching tool. Pros of using Facebook were notably the high frequency with which students consult it, the possibility for a live discussion forum in which students are more likely to post and the use of Facebook for pastoral care. But using Facebook raises issues – notably regarding the privacy of teachers and students. She recommended using a separate Facebook account for professional use and to thoroughly check your university guidelines on the use of social media.

Marking & Providing Feedback Workshop

Grant Stirling

The final session was designed to provide an insight into how early career academics might best approach the challenges associated with marking and providing feedback in a European Studies context.

Our first speaker was Giacomo Orsini of the University of Essex, who discussed his recent marking experience in the context of undergraduate sociology teaching. Giacomo focused on three areas in particular: standards, time management and feedback. Giacomo provided a particularly useful insight into the specific challenges that an early career researcher faces in terms of marking and how to address such challenges.

Our second speaker was Dr Christine Reh, Senior Lecturer in politics at University College London. Christine, who has significant experience of marking at both undergraduate and postgraduate levels, began with the reassuring message that the process of marking does become considerably easier with experience. Christine’s talk then focused upon the issues of ‘judgment and justification’, ‘responsibility with marking’ and time management. Christine emphasised the importance of marking in strict accordance with the specific criteria which students are provided with as well as the course syllabus. Christine also provided suggestions as to where to seek help when particular challenges arise.

The talks of our speakers were followed by a series of relevant questions from the floor and interesting discussion, covering topics including weighting of marking criteria and objective versus relative grading.

Marking and providing feedback are perhaps among the more daunting tasks that early career academics face, so thanks must go to Giacomo and Christine for their informative and concise advice on how to approach this challenge.

Getting a Job after your PhD

A regular feature at the SF Seminars, this session gave participants the opportunity to hear from an established scholar, alongside recent PhD graduates who have successfully secured positions following their PhDs. Roberta Guerrina (University of Surrey), began with the recruiter’s perspective and talked about the importance of getting noticed by any potential employer. She went on to explain how CV building through teaching, publishing and coauthoring can help towards achieving this. Recent PhD graduates, Tomas Maltby (King’s College London) and Kathryn Simpson (University of Manchester), then shared their experiences and offered up some tips to help overcome the challenge of finding and getting a job after the PhD.

Further Info

Listen to a selection of audio recordings of sessions: www.uaces.org/8102

Find out more about the SF Seminars: www.uaces.org/8103
March

Drones and International Security: A European Contribution
Aarhus, 5-6 March 2015
www.uaces.org/1371

EUSA 2015 Biennial Conference
Boston, 5-7 March 2015
www.uaces.org/1199

New Perspectives in European Studies:
Europeanisation in the EU and the Neighbourhood
Belfast, 6-8 March 2015
www.uaces.org/1206

Assessing the Performance of the European Union in Central and Eastern Europe and in its Neighbourhood
Manchester, 12-13 March 2015
www.uaces.org/1325

Fringe Politics in Southeastern Europe II:
Conservative Social Movements and the Mainstreaming of Extremism
Graz, 19-20 March 2015
www.uaces.org/1249

PSA Annual International Conference 2015
Sheffield, 30 March 2015 - 1 April 2015
www.uaces.org/1219

BISA PGN Annual Conference
London, 30 March 2015
www.uaces.org/1274

April

The State of the Union: the Scottish Referendum and the Future of the UK
Liverpool, 9 April 2015
www.uaces.org/1220

Narratives of European Integration: 11th History of European Integration Research Society Conference
Portsmouth, 15-16 April 2015
www.uaces.org/1195

In Search of a Model for the Middle East:
A Comparison of the Turkish and Nordic Experiences
Lund, 16-17 April 2015
www.uaces.org/1250

Asser 50 years: European Law Symposium
The Hague, 23 April 2015
www.uaces.org/1364

May

Studying Social Movements against EU Austerity
Roskilde, 7-8 May 2015
www.uaces.org/1362

Active Citizenship, Identity and Democratic Governance in the European Union
Oradea, 21-22 May 2015
www.uaces.org/1337
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Union and the Arctic</td>
<td>29-30 May 2015</td>
<td>Dundee, 29-30 May</td>
<td><a href="http://www.uaces.org/1238">www.uaces.org/1238</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulling Together or Pulling Apart: Spain, Europe, the West</td>
<td>25-27 June 2015</td>
<td>Dublin, 25-27 June</td>
<td><a href="http://www.uaces.org/1329">www.uaces.org/1329</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platform Ukraine</td>
<td>5-6 June 2015</td>
<td>London, 5-6 June</td>
<td><a href="http://www.uaces.org/1299">www.uaces.org/1299</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insecurity Complexes the Response of the EU and the Member States</td>
<td>11-12 June 2015</td>
<td>Catania, 11-12 June</td>
<td><a href="http://www.uaces.org/1293">www.uaces.org/1293</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insecurity Complexes the Response of the EU and the Member States</td>
<td>11-12 June 2015</td>
<td>Catania, 11-12 June</td>
<td><a href="http://www.uaces.org/1293">www.uaces.org/1293</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional events are listed at: www.uaces.org/diary
Recent Books

The Growth of Biofuels in the 21st Century: Policy Drivers and Market Challenges

Robert Ackrill & Adrian Kay
Palgrave
ISBN: 9781137307880 (hb)
GBP: 65.00

Crisis in the Eurozone: Causes, Dilemmas and Solutions

Mark Baimbridge & Philip B Whyman
Palgrave
ISBN: 9781137329028 (hb)
GBP: 75.00

Cultures of Democracy in Serbia and Bulgaria

James Dawson
Ashgate
ISBN: 9781472443083 (hb)
GBP: 58.50

Pandora, Penelope, Polity: How to Change the European Union

Andrew Duff
John Harper Publishing
ISBN: 9780992974862 (pb)
GBP: 11.50

The Neighbours of the European Union’s Neighbours

Sieglinde Gstöhl and Erwan Lannon
Ashgate
ISBN: 9781472417770 (hb)
GBP: 63.00

A Converging Post-War European Discourse War Experience, Changing Security Concepts, and Research and Education

Thomas Hoerber
Lexington Books
ISBN: 9780739192122 (hb)
USD: 120.00

The Foreign Policies of Post-Yugoslav States: From Yugoslavia to Europe (ed)

Soeren Keil & Bernhard Stahl (eds)
Palgrave
ISBN: 9781137384126 (hb)
GBP: 95.00

The EU and Member State Building: European Foreign Policy in the Western Balkans

Soeren Keil & Zeynep Arkan (eds)
Routledge
ISBN: 9780415855181 (hb)
GBP: 85.00

Progress through crisis? Proceedings of the conference for the 20th anniversary of the establishment of the European Monetary Institute

Ivo Maes & Frank Moss (eds)
European Central Bank
ISBN: 9789289913966 (ebook)
EUR: free

The Rise and Fall of Ireland’s Celtic Tiger: Liberalism, Boom and Bust

Seán Ó’Riain
Cambridge University Press
ISBN: 9780521279055 (pb)
GBP: 20.00

Institutional and Policy Change in the European Parliament: Deciding on Freedom, Security and Justice

Ariadna Ripoll Servent
Palgrave
ISBN: 9781137410542 (hb)
GBP: 68.00

More books are listed at: www.uaces.org/bookshop
UACES Scholars 2015

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

Diana KUDAIBERGENOVA
PhD Research Topic
Nationalising Regimes and Nation-Building in Post-Socialist Europe and Central Eurasia

Helen KEIGHLEY
PhD Research Topic
Combating Corruption in the European Union: Explaining Transposition Deficits in Anti-Bribery Legislation

Ragnar WEILANDT
PhD Research Topic
Tunisian and Moroccan Perceptions of the EU. The Role of the Media

Igor MERHEIM-EYRE
PhD Research Topic
The European Union’s Visa Diplomacy in the Eastern Partnership Countries

UACES Student Forum: New Members Elected

Viviane Gravey, UACES Student Forum Chair

Three new UACES Student Forum committee members were elected at last November’s UACES SF seminar on teaching skills for postgraduates. Mariagiulia Amadio is a second year PhD student working on EU foreign and security policy at Luiss University in Rome, she will be collaborating with the editors of JCER, ensuring continued strong links between the Student Forum and the Journal of Contemporary European Research. Dee Goddard is a first year PhD Student at the University of Kent where she works on the representation of women in political executives across the EU member states. She will be working alongside Rachael Dickson and Viviane Gravey on organizing the forthcoming Belfast UACES SF Research Conference ‘Ever challenged Union: exploring ways out of the crises’ (29-30 June). Finally, Anna Wambach is a 2nd year PhD Student at Newcastle University where she studies media representations of the EU in British news coverage. She will be coordinating the EURORESEARCH mailing list and the UACES SF newsletter.
### Appointments and Awards

- Mark BELL has been appointed Professor of Law at Trinity College Dublin.
- Davor JANCIC has been appointed as a Senior Researcher in EU Law at the TMC Asser Institute.
- Tomas MALTBY has been appointed Lecturer in International Politics at King’s College London.
- Martin SILZER has been appointed Head of Office of the European Office of the Local Authorities of Baden-Württember.
- Julie SMITH, University of Cambridge, has joined the House of Lords as a Working Peer.
- Mor SOBOL has been appointed Postdoctoral Fellow at the Institute of European and American Studies, Academia Sinica.
- Benjamin LERUTH has been appointed Research Associate at the School of Social Policy, Sociology and Social Research, University of Kent.
- Angela CARPENTER was awarded the Gold Award in the Scientific Papers category at the Global Chemical Leasing Awards 2014.

### Major New ESRC Initiative

The ESRC has launched a major new programme of work to explore the relationship between the UK and the European Union. The UK in a Changing Europe programme will focus on the implications of changes in governance, policies and social and political attitudes, at both EU and the UK levels, for the UK-EU relationship. The initiative will contribute to policy and political debates and deliver independent social scientific research to key stakeholder groups. It will also establish itself as a key source of impartial research-based knowledge. A number of sources of funding are being made available, including a Commissioning Fund providing small amounts of funding for applicants interested in pursuing dissemination and impact focused activities related to the overall aims of the initiative.

Further info: www.uaces.org/8104

### Elections

The build-up for the 2015 elections has been intense, not least for the influence they will have on the future direction of Europe. Many forecasters and analysts have predicted that the result of the UACES Committee election will have significantly more impact than the election in Andorra on 8 March. Opinion is split on whether the results will be more, or less significant, than the results of the UK general election in May. There has been consensus however, on the UACES election being more sophisticated, given the use of electronic ballots and preferential voting. If your membership is up-to-date, look out for your ballot paper, which will be delivered by email in the near future.
Update on Bilbao Annual Conference

Thank you to everyone who submitted a paper proposal for the upcoming Annual Conference in Bilbao in September. The CfP was UACES’ largest ever and saw a 29% increase on last year’s call for Cork. Preparations for the conference are well underway and as well as the usual evening receptions, we’ll be offering a pintxos (tapas like delicacies from the Basque Country) tour. There’s even talk of pintxos related papers featuring in the research programme - which would definitely be a first at a UACES conference.

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

Further info: www.uaces.org/bilbao

Study Tour to Geneva

The European Atlantic Movement (TEAM) organised a five day trip (26-29 October 2014) to Geneva which gave students and interested professional individuals the opportunity to visit international bodies and to hear from distinguished speakers. Organisations visited as part of the tour included the World Health Organisation (WHO), The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR), Democratic Control of Armed Forces (DCAF), United Nations Palais des Nations, EU delegation to the UN, and the Graduate Institute for International Relations.

TEAM is an independent non-party political educational foundation and aims to promote an understanding and discussion of world affairs amongst young people

Further info: www.uaces.org/8105

UACES 2016

The 46th UACES Annual Conference takes place from 5-7 September 2016 in London. Our host, Queen Mary University of London and its recently established Centre for European Research and the School of Politics and International Relations, will provide an interdisciplinary forum for the exchange of ideas on research and teaching on Europe in the heart of London’s East End. The Centre is also home to two highly successful and prestigious publications: East European Politics (edited by Professor Adam Fagan) and the European Journal for Political Research Political Data Yearbook (co-edited by Dr Rainbow Murray).

Historically the Mile End campus was the home of the People’s Palace, later named Queen Mary College, which started in 1887 as a philanthropic centre to provide east Londoners with educational, cultural and social activities.

London is one of the most diverse cities in the world with a kaleidoscope of cultures, people and history. This is particularly noticeable in London’s East End, a rapidly developing part of the city, and destination for the 2016 conference. Sample a curry or grab a bagel on the famous Brick Lane; take a stroll down the historic Regent’s canal and experience Broadway Market’s cafes, shops and stalls; or visit London’s Olympic Park and its iconic sporting venues. If you’re up for even more, hop on a train and be ready to explore the sights of central London in only 20 minutes.

Further info: www.uaces.org/london
CSDP Strategy
Brussels, 23 January 2015

The CRN CSDP Strategy held its third and final expert workshop focusing on the capability implications that a possible CSDP strategy can have in the aftermath of the financial crisis. The event was hosted by the EGMONT institute for International Relations (Sven Biscop) and took place in the Orange Room of the Egmont Palace – an ideal venue for debating these issues among academics, policy practitioners and think tank experts.

The day started with an illuminating presentation by Christian Madsen, Head of Capabilities Support Unit, Capabilities Directorate at the European Defence Agency. He presented the new Capability Development Plan and answered questions in a Q&A session chaired by Brigadier General Jo Coelmont, Senior Associate Fellow at EGMONT.

The first panel of the workshop covered the institutional dimension of capability development on the EU level, ranging from analyses of institutional projects and member states preferences (Chappell & Petrov); European defence industrial policies (Mawdsley); and the European Council’s capability promises (Sweeney). The panel - moderated by Daniel Fiott (IES, VUB) – instigated interesting discussions on cross-cutting academic and policy related issues.

After a delicious lunch offered in the beautiful surroundings of the Egmont Palace, the workshop continued with the second panel devoted to current day policy issues such as EU-NATO relations in the context of the Ukraine crisis (Daehnhardt); EU actorness in cyber security (Carrapico & Barrinha); and transatlantic impressions of military transformation in Europe (Galbreath & Smith). Chaired by Vivien Pertusot, (IFRI-Brussels), the panel offered another stimulating discussion and provided the backdrop for the last session – the roundtable with policy practitioners. The latter involved Brig-Gen Heinz Krieb, (Director for Concepts & Capabilities EUMS); Guillaume de la Brosse (EDA) and Annelies Verstichel (Belgian delegate in the Politico-Military Group), and was chaired by Sven Biscop. The round table offered a refreshingly frank discussion regarding the institutions’ progress and challenges in bringing forward the mandates allocated by the December 2013 European Council on Defence, in preparation for the June 2015 European Council.

Two new CRNs launched

Financial Accountability in the European Union

There have been fast-paced and significant developments in the economic governance of the EU over the last five years since the global financial crisis. The rationale for this CRN stems from the realisation that greater academic attention is now being paid by some researchers to questions related to the financing and financial management of the European Union. At present these researchers are working in isolation, with different perspectives on questions of finance: on auditing and the study of the European Court of Auditors, itself a comparatively neglected object of study in the EU; on central banks and the ECB; on policies such as the CAP and Structural Funds; on the emergence of new tools such as the European Stability Mechanism, and on questions of institutional reform, including the creation of a European Public Prosecutor’s Office (EPPO). The aim is to bring together researchers to create synergies and engage in a cross-fertilisation of ideas and approaches.

Further information: www.uaces.org/eufinacco

European Energy Policy

This CRN network aims to examine the tensions and ambiguities affecting energy policy in the EU from a multi-disciplinary perspective. Bringing together scholars working on energy policy in the EU from different disciplines, the network will draw on the work of a number of already established study groups. There will however be a focus on a number of emerging and horizontal issues including the complexity of European energy policy given its cross-cutting nature; the challenges for multi-level governance in EU policy making and implementation considering the spectrum of public, private and third sector involvement and the internal-external nexus of all dimensions of EU energy policy.

Further information: www.uaces.org/energy

European Energy Policy CRN Workshop
Norwich, 25-26 June 2015

This two-day workshop aims to investigate energy policy in the EU from a multi-disciplinary perspective. The workshop will take place at the Norwich Business School of the University of East Anglia.

Further information: www.uaces.org/1335

CRN Applications Invited for the next round of Collaborative Research Network funding.

Deadline: 30 October 2015

Further info: www.uaces.org/networks
Northern Ireland, the United Kingdom and the European Union: Facing the Prospect of Change

Belfast, 9 October 2014

David Phinnemore, Queen’s University Belfast

This one-day event set out to explore the implications of the evolving debate on the current and future nature of the UK’s relationship with the EU for Northern Ireland. Participants included academics, current and former civil servants, politicians, as well as representatives from business, non-governmental organisations and civil society. In the first of three sessions Mary Murphy (University College Cork) offered analysis and comment on the current state of Northern Ireland’s engagement with the European Union. Following reflections from Paul Gillespie (Institute for International and European Affairs, and Irish Times) the discussion then moved on to consider the potential implications of the Scottish referendum for current relations between the countries of the United Kingdom (including Northern Ireland) and the European Union.

The focus of the day’s second session was how changes in the UK’s membership might affect Northern Ireland. Following presentations from Michael Keating (University of Aberdeen) on the changing nature of the United Kingdom within the EU and David Phinnemore (Queen’s University Belfast) on the possible shape of a redefined relationship between the United Kingdom and the EU, participants considered some of the many socio-economic, political, constitutional, and social challenges that change would pose for Northern Ireland.

The third closed session began to consider more explicitly the implications of a possible ‘Brexit’ for Northern Ireland. Roger Liddle (House of Lords/Policy Network) considered the wider implications of withdrawal for the United Kingdom while Daithi O’Ceallaigh (Institute for International and European Affairs) offered a view from Dublin and set out some of the likely consequences for north-south relations and the island of Ireland as a whole.

The day’s proceedings ended with a public panel discussion on Northern Ireland and a changing European Union at which Mary Murphy and Paul Gillespie were joined on the panel by Colette Fitzgerald (European Commission Office, Belfast). As with the earlier sessions the discussion highlighted many challenges that a changed UK-EU relationship and especially Brexit would pose for Northern Ireland, particularly given the border with the Republic of Ireland. It also revealed a distinct lack of public debate on the issue with political parties, the Assembly and the media so far barely engaging.
Interpreting British European Policy

Guest Editors: Mark Bevir, Oliver Daddow and Pauline Schnapper

Britain has had particular problems reconciling itself to the idea of being a ‘European’ actor and a wholehearted member of the EEC/EU since 1973. Now, potentially, the ‘awkward partner’ is edging towards the exit door of the EU because a referendum gauging the opinion of a sullenly Eurosceptical UK public is a likely prospect in the coming years. The aim of this special issue of JCMS is to consider how one can account for the present state of affairs by adopting an interpretivist perspective on British European policy over the past four decades. The article begins with a comprehensive review of the extant literature on Britain and Europe and an elaboration of the ‘traditions and dilemmas’ framework within which the contributors have studied the empirical material in their articles. It then explains the major themes that connect the articles and suggests how future research might build on the agenda proposed in this special issue.
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Safeguarding British Identity or Betraying It? The Role of British ‘Tradition’ in the Parliamentary Great Debate on EC Membership, October 1971 by N. PIERS LUDLOW

The Return of ‘Englishness’ in British Political Culture – The End of the Unions? by MICHAEL KENNY

Educating Britain? Political Literacy and the Construction of National History by HELEN BROCKLEHURST

Interpreting the Outsider Tradition in British European Policy Speeches from Thatcher to Cameron by OLIVER DADDOW

‘One Woman’s Prejudice’: Did Margaret Thatcher Cause Britain’s Anti-Europeanism? by CARY FONTANA AND CRAIG PARSONS

Between One-Nation Toryism and Neoliberalism: The Dilemmas of British Conservatism and Britain’s Evolving Place in Europe by MARK I. VAIL

Euro scepticism and the Anglophone: Traditions and Dilemmas in Contemporary English Nationalism by BEN WELLINGS AND HELEN BAXENDALE

Reworking the Euro sceptic and Conservative Traditions into a Populist Narrative: UKIP’s Winning Formula? by KARINE TOURNIER-SOL

The Labour Party and Europe from Brown to Miliband: Back to the Future? by PAULINE SCHNAPPER