

Kolleg-Forschergruppe
Ihnestr. 26
14195 Berlin
www.transformeurope.eu
transform-europe@fu-berlin.de
+49 – 30 83 85 70 31

Editorial Staff:
Sasan Abdi
Jessica Beck
Toshiya Izumo
Jan Kratochvil
Astrid Roos



Headlines

New colleagues at the KFG

We are pleased to announce that Prof. Ockert Dupper and Prof. Wolfram Kaiser have joined the Kolleg-Forschergruppe.

Page. 5

Call for Applications: Postdocs

The Kolleg-Forschergruppe "The Transformative Power of Europe. External and Internal Diffusion of Ideas in the European Union" awards up to 6 post-doctoral fellows.

Page. 6

New Junior Research Group

The Junior Research Group on "Asian Perceptions of the EU" is currently being established at the KFG as the first Associated Project.

Page. 6

Capitalist Governance after the Crisis

A report on a workshop that was organized by Prof. David Levi-Faur in cooperation with Dr. Diether Plehwe from the Social Science Research Center (WZB).

Page. 7

How Does Europe Diffuse?

On December 8-9, 2010, researchers at the Kolleg-Forschergruppe and 14 guests convened to discuss how European integration transforms other regions.

Page. 8

KFG International Conference

This year, the Kolleg-Forschergruppe dedicated its international conference to the diffusion of regional integration - a report.

Page. 10

Faraway so Close?

A conference that aimed to turn the by now conventional EU-Turkey controversy into a conversation by bringing scholars from various fields together.

Page. 12

CfP: Mapping Agency

A Call for Papers for workshop comparing regionalism in Sub-Saharan Africa convened by Dr. des. Ulrike Lorenz and Dr. Martin Rempe.

Page. 14

LSEE-KFG Research Workshop

A workshop that aims to bring together scholars and practitioners, both within Western Europe and the region, working on aspects of environmental governance and regulation in new member states.

Page. 15

Latest Working Papers

An overview presenting the latest Working Papers of the Kolleg-Forschergruppe since November 2010.

Page. 16

About the *Kolleg-Forschergruppe* (KFG)

The diffusion of ideas has become a central research theme in political science, sociology, law, history, and economics. In this context, the *Kolleg-Forschergruppe* (KFG) focuses on how ideas are spread across time and space, as can be observed especially in the European Union in various socio-political fields.

The *Kolleg-Forschergruppe* (KFG) is a new funding program launched by the German Research Foundation (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft – DFG) in 2008. As a Research College, it is intended to provide a scientifically stimulating environment in which innovative research topics can be dealt with by discourse and debate within a small group of senior and junior researchers.

Editorial



Prof. Tanja A. Börzel & Prof. Thomas Risse

Dear friends and colleagues of the Kolleg-Forschergruppe,

Welcome to the fifth edition of our newsletter informing you about what is going on at the Kolleg-Forschergruppe (KFG)!

We look back on a very active autumn and winter-season with a good number of activities. Here are some highlights of what has happened since October: the Kolleg-Forschergruppe hosted several workshops and conferences, mainly concentrating on norm and rule transfer and comparative regionalism. On this occasion, we would like to congratulate our extremely active postdoctoral fellows and senior scholars who organized many of these workshops themselves and saw to it that they led excellent intellectual exchanges. Moreover, we are particularly grateful that we have such a superb administrative team led by Astrid Roos and Ina Norwald.

The most important event at the KFG in the fall was our second international conference in December on comparative regionalism. More than 80 scholars from around the world debated the various forms of regional cooperation, the role of the EU in promoting regional integration, and the diffusion of various integration models (see the more detailed report in this newsletter).

In addition, during an author's workshop for a special issue of *West European Politics* on "When Europeanization Travels: From Europeanization to Diffusion", we discussed to what extent European approaches to policy-making as well as institutional models of the European Union (EU) diffuse across its borders.

In a joint workshop organized by David Levi-Faur (currently Senior Fellow at the KFG) and Dieter Plehwe (Social Science Research Center Berlin), an international and interdisciplinary group of scholars reviewed past research on capitalism and its various institutional varieties and sought to develop research agendas reinvigorated through the global financial, economic and regulatory crisis. Shortly after, two former post-doctoral fellows, Anja Jetschke and Osvaldo Saldías, invited researchers to an intensive workshop which focused on the question through which mechanisms and processes the European integration transforms other regions.

Last but not least, the list of activities was completed with a conference jointly organized by Bilgin Ayata (currently post-doctoral fellow at the KFG) and Banu Karaca (Sabanci University, Istanbul). International scholars searched for fresh and innovative approaches in the debate about Turkey's EU accession. You find detailed reports of these activities in this newsletter.

In the meantime, we are happy to welcome two new Visiting Fellows: Prof. Ockert Dupper (University of Stellenbosch) arrived in January and will spend six months with us. As a Professor of Labour and Social Security Law he has worked intensively on affirmative action, non-discrimination and social security. Moreover, Prof. Wolfram Kaiser (University of Portsmouth) is joining the KFG and will spend the following year with us. Wolfram Kaiser is one of the most important historians of European integration and his perspective will enrich our discussions at the KFG. We look forward to working with Ockert and Wolfram.

Please note that we have advertised for another round of post-doctoral fellowships starting in autumn this year. We are also proud to announce that the Junior Research Group on „Asian Perceptions of the EU“ started

its work at the KFG. Under the direction of Dr. May-Britt U. Stumbaum, the group scrutinizes the perceptions of Chinese and Indian elites of the EU as a civilian power – and why these views differ significantly from the EU's internal debates.

As you can see, the Kolleg-Forscherguppe continues to be an active and lively center of research in EU studies. For all interested in our latest publications and future activities, you will find related information at the end of this newsletter. Among others, Ulrike Lorenz and Martin Rempe (both post-doctoral fellows) have organized a workshop on "Mapping agency. Comparing regionalisms in Sub-Saharan Africa", for which you find a call for papers.

We hope that you enjoy reading about the KFGs activities in this newsletter.

Best regards,

Tanja A. Börzel Thomas Risse
Research Directors

New colleagues at the KFG

We are pleased to announce that Prof. Ockert Dupper has joined the Kolleg-Forschergruppe in January. Furthermore, Prof. Wolfram Kaiser will be Senior Fellow from March onwards.



Prof. Ockert Dupper

Ockert Dupper (BA (Stell); LLB (Cape Town); LLM; SJD (Harvard)) is Professor of Labour - and Social Security Law at the University of Stellenbosch, where he also serves as the Director of the Centre for International and Comparative Labour and Social Security Law (CICLASS). In 2002/03, he was a Faculty Fellow in Ethics at the Edmond J. Safra Center for Ethics at Harvard University. Between 2004 and 2006, he was a visiting researcher at the Max Planck Institute for Social Law in Munich, Germany. He is a member of the Academic Advisory Council of the German-South African Lawyers Association (Deutsch-Südafrikanische-Juristenvereinigung e.V.). Ockert Dupper has published widely on a range of issues, in particular on affirmative action, non-discrimination and social security. During his time at the KFG he will be writing on the issue of social protection for migrants in the Southern African Development Community (SADC); in particular on the relevance of EU coordination rules for the region.



Prof. Wolfram Kaiser

Wolfram Kaiser (BA/MA and PhD Hamburg) is Professor of European Studies at the University of Portsmouth in England where he leads the “Transnational Europe” research group. He is also a Visiting Professor at the College of Europe in Bruges. Wolfram Kaiser has been (inter alia) a visiting fellow/professor at the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study in the Humanities and Social Sciences, the Europa Institute at the University of Edinburgh, the Center for European Integration Studies at the University of Bonn and the Norwegian Nobel Institute in Oslo. His publications include wide research on European integration and European Union politics in past and present. During his time at the KFG Wolfram Kaiser will continue to work on two monographs, one on strategies of putting the European Union and its history into museums and the other on the role of experts and international organizations in governing Europe since 1850. These projects, as well as his other research interests, relate to issues of governance, varieties of regionalism and European identity and identity construction, which are at the heart of the KFG research program.

Call for Applications: Postdoctoral Fellowships at the KFG

Fellowships: 6 postdoctoral fellowships

Date/duration: 10 months fellowships starting October 2011

Deadline for Applications: 1 April 2011
(Successful candidates will be informed by end April 2011)

The Kolleg-Forschergruppe "The Transformative Power of Europe. External and Internal Diffusion of Ideas in the European Union", directed by Profs. Tanja Börzel and Thomas Risse, awards up to 6 post-doctoral fellows. We particularly encourage applications on projects located in the field of comparative regionalism.

The fellows should have their PhD in hand by the fall of 2011. The duration of the fellowship is 10 months (October 1, 2011 - July 31, 2012) with the possibility to reapply. The stipend amounts to € 30.000 annually (including travelling expenses).

The following materials should be submitted:

- CV and list of publications
- Proposal for a post-doctoral project
- Transcripts of degrees and other relevant material
- Two letters of reference

Please send your application to the following address:

Freie Universität Berlin

Otto-Suhr-Institute for Political Science
Research College "Transformative Power of Europe"

Prof. Dr. Tanja A. Börzel and Prof. Dr. Thomas Risse
Innestr. 26
D-14195 Berlin
Germany

Or via email to: transform-europe@fu-berlin.de
For further information please consider the relevant FAQ section or contact us at transform-europe@fu-berlin.de

New Junior Research Group on "Asian Perceptions of the EU" at the KFG



Dr. May-Britt U. Stumbaum

The Junior Research Group (German: NFG) on "Asian Perceptions of the EU" is currently being established at the KFG as the first Associated Project. Under the direction of Dr. May-Britt U. Stumbaum, the group scrutinizes the perceptions of Chinese and

Indian elites of the EU as a civilian power – and why these differ significantly from the EU debate on

EU foreign policy. Following an interdisciplinary approach, the core research work will focus on social, cultural, political and historical factors that influence perceptions among those elites in Asian countries. It aims to offer an insight into debates within these countries on the EU as an actor in security-related fields. The Junior Research Group will consist of eight staff members coming from Europe, the Middle East, India and China, and will build up a "Networked Think Tank" with partner research groups that work on related issues, such as the National Centre for Research on Europe at the University of Canterbury, NZ. The group is complemented by a Visiting Fellow Program for researchers from the region. The Junior Research Group "Asian Perceptions of the EU" has been selected as one of seven groups by a competitive call of the German Ministry of Education and Research's initiative "Europe as seen from the outside". The grant amounts to a total about € 1,2 million for a period of four years. Findings and calls will regularly be disseminated at www.asianperceptions.eu.

Workshop Report

“Rethinking Capitalist Governance after the Crises”

*Workshop held on December 2-3, 2010
by David Levi-Faur and Dieter Plehwe*



Prof. David Levi-Faur

The global financial, economic and regulatory crises have reinvigorated a wide range of discussions about the character of capitalism and its various institutional varieties. The workshop was organized by David Levi-Faur (Senior Fellow, KFG) and Dieter

Plehwe (Social Science Research Center Berlin) in cooperation with the Kolleg-Forschergruppe. It brought together an international and interdisciplinary consortium of scholars to recapitulate past research and to develop research agendas at different macro- or micro levels of inquiry. Three questions stood at the centre of the discussion. First, do these crises call for limited regulatory reforms of the financial system only, or does it take a more comprehensive approach to overcome the series of defects generated by neoliberalism? Second, what are the tensions that these crises reveal or exacerbate in the institutional arrangements that hold the capitalist system together? Third, what are the options for regulatory reforms that might moderate these tensions and help to reinforce progressive distributive, redistributive and regulatory systems?

The discussions were organized in four sessions. The first session focused on the causes of the global financial crisis with three presentations by Andreas Nölke (University of Frankfurt), Arndt Sorge (Social Science Research Center Berlin) and Hans-Jürgen Bieling (University of Bremen). The discussion revealed that different types of capitalism have been involved in very different ways with regard to the causes of the crisis. At the same time,

there are different effects in different countries. Studies of the various countries mainly do insist that the differences between liberal and coordinated market economies come up against limits at the same time, because they fail to address the strong interrelations between the systems and the transnational dimensions of the crisis and its impact. Hans-Jürgen Bieling suggested advancing the agenda via a comparative research on different forms of financialization, looking at the interaction of endogenous (national) and exogenous factors.

The second session focused on the impact of the crisis with regard to more specific issues and policies. The contributions of Annette Töller (Hagen University) and Volker Schneider (University of Konstanz) showed that in the field of environmental legislation no change can be observed so far, though a shift from political to economic frames can be discerned in climate change discourse. Structural differences and patterns of transformations in the regulatory state were addressed by Thomas Eimer (Freie Universität Berlin), Sandra Eckert (University of Osnabrück), Jacint Jordana (Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona), and Hanan Haber (Hebrew University, Jerusalem) based on examples in patenting, the postal telecommunications and electricity sectors. David Levi-Faur suggested that one important venue for advancing our research is to bring together literatures on the regulatory, development and welfare state that have been developed by and large in isolation from each other until now.

The third session of the workshop dealt with corporate governance issues after the crisis and in particular with the tensions and contradictions that were revealed even more clearly after it. Ruth

Aguilera (University of Illinois), Gregory Jackson (Freie Universität Berlin) and Sigurt Vitols (Social Science Research Center Berlin) presented the results of quantitative analysis speaking inter alia to the relationship between self-interest (business reputation) and regulatory requirements in the evolution of corporate social responsibility (CSR).

The last session came back to the financial sector. In contrast to the first panel, the contributions by Sebastian Botzem (Social Science Research Center Berlin), Ronen Mandelkern (Max Planck Institute for the Study of Societies, Cologne), Karin Fischer

(University of Linz) and Dieter Plehwe aimed at studying the changes in actor constellations and traced processes relevant to the analysis of institutional change. If the discussion on institutional change and the development of capitalism so far focused mainly on the incomplete reproduction of national institutional configurations, the papers in this session emphasized the transnational dimensions of actor networks or discourse coalitions in order to explore complementary, interrelated and additional mechanisms of institutional change important to the contemporary transformation of globalized capitalism.

Workshop Report

“How Does Europe Diffuse? – Comparative Regionalism and the Causal Mechanisms of Diffusion.”

*Workshop held on December 8-9, 2010
by Anja Jetschke and Osvaldo Saldías*

Workshop Convenors



Dr. Anja Jetschke



Dr. Osvaldo Saldías

Aim of the Workshop

On December 8-9, 2010, researchers at the Kolleg-Forschergruppe “The Transformative Power of Europe” and 14 guests convened at the Freie Universität Berlin to discuss how European integration transforms other regions and through

which mechanisms this takes place. One goal of the workshop, organized by Anja Jetschke (University of Freiburg) and Osvaldo Saldías (Humboldt University) - both former Post-doctoral fellows at the KFG - was to seek conceptual clarity on the individual mechanisms of diffusion. Another goal was to explore fields where “diffusion” has already been utilized to make transfers to Europe’s transformative power.

Participants enjoyed discussions and network building, and the papers provided a good overview of methodological approaches on diffusion research within and on the EU. Participants represented several theoretical camps: the Europeanization and diffusion literature, rationalist and constructivist approaches and empirically and theoretically oriented research interests. The workshop notably helped identify the strengths and weaknesses of the two main approaches: The

Europeanization literature's limited approach to conditionality and the diffusion literature's primary focus on single policy adoptions rather than adoptions of institutions. A need to focus more on the actors driving diffusion processes was identified.

Main Ideas and Content

The first of five panels aimed at conceptualizing the impact of Europe. Tobias Lenz (University of Oxford, currently KFG) and Simon Fink (University of Bamberg) developed concepts of diffusion which were drawn on two distinct literatures: one on Europeanization and one on diffusion. While Lenz argued for distinguishing mechanisms according to senders and receivers and their respective logics of action, Fink aspired to bring more coherence into the various diffusion mechanisms through a unified taxonomy for diffusion literature.

The second panel analyzed concrete instances of diffusion. Simon Hollis (Berlin Graduate School for Transnational Studies) presented on disaster management and developed competing hypotheses for the behavioral observations of both a sociological and rationalist account of diffusion. Dimiter Toshkov (Leiden University) pointed to the difficulties of separating a rationalist explanation from a sociological one and developed a model for public policy diffusion. Anja Jetschke's paper on the adoption of the ASEAN Charter also discussed the difficulty of tracing the mechanisms of diffusion and she suggested defining mechanisms according to the scope conditions found by other studies on diffusion.

Regionalism, isomorphism, and networks were the focus of panel three where the steep rise in the number of regional organizations and their lack of efficiency was addressed. Drawing on network analysis, Sebastian Krapohl and Simon Fink (both University of Bamberg) argued that patterns of economic interdependence differ significantly in northern and southern hemispheres, which influences integration outcomes and renders diffusion challenging. Joseph Jupille and Brandy Jolliff (University of Boulder at Colorado) drew on a Meyeran account of isomorphism to examine world scripts with regard to integration arrangements

and they contended that countries with "problematic identities" related to sovereignty are more likely to adopt such scripts. Focusing on judicial institutions, Osvaldo Saldías suggested that networks of professionals play a decisive role in the diffusion of courts. The establishment of the Andean Court of Justice was traced back to an organized group of lawyers and European Commission (EC) officials advocating for the emulation of the European Court of Justice (ECJ).

Panel four focused again on methodological issues. Torben Heinze (Freie Universität Berlin) analyzed lump sums in the budgeting of higher education in the EU using event history and fuzzy set Qualitative Comparative Analysis (fsQCA). Dorian Jano's approach (University of Milano) to Europeanization in the West Balkans argued that external incentives are both necessary and sufficient for CEE countries to adopt and implement EU standards. Julia Langbein (KFG) also explored the scope conditions for Europeanization in two issue areas in the Ukraine: technical regulation and shareholder's rights. She found that convergence is more likely when external incentives are flanked by capacity building measures that target both public and private actors.

The last panel was dedicated to policy diffusion in environmental politics. Katja Biedenkopf (Vrije Universiteit Brussels) traced the diffusion of EU environmental laws into the US primarily through interviews. Frank Mattheis (University of Leipzig) focused on regional organizations in Africa and Latin America and suggested inter-regionalism as a possible channel of diffusion between organizations in the global south. Jan-Henrik Meyer (University of Aarhus) traced the emergence of environmental policies within the European Union and suggested that once ideas reach a conceptual consensus, emulation can be favored and become path dependent. We would like to express our gratitude to Tanja Börzel (FU Berlin), Paul W. Thurner (University of Munich), David Levi-Faur (Jerusalem University), Alex Warleigh-Lack (Brunel University), Joseph Jupille (University of Boulder) and Frank Schimmelfenning (ETH Zurich) who provided constructive criticism of the papers.

Conference Report

“The Diffusion of Regional Integration”

KFG-International Conference, December 8-9, 2010.

by Jessica Beck

This year, the Kolleg-Forschergruppe dedicated its international conference to the diffusion of regional integration. Scholars from 14 different countries presented papers that focused on the question to what extent European integrations has served as a model in other regions, whether the EU has sought to export its policies and institutions to other regions, compared the experiences and attempts at regional integration outside of Europe, and what the theoretical and methodological challenges of comparative regionalism are.

Here are some highlights of the discussions: In the first panel, Joseph Jupille and Brandy Joliff’s paper (University of Colorado at Boulder) identified three different roles the EU could play when promoting regionalism abroad: the EU as a model, a method, and a mentor. Tatiana Skripka (Kolleg-Forschergruppe, Freie Universität Berlin) suggested that the EU model offered a “set of templates” comprised of institutional, normative and substantive models, which could be applied and adapted on a case by case basis in different regions.

The second panel was dedicated to the EU as Exporter of Policies and included presentations by Francesco Duina (Bates College, Lewiston), Fiona Marshall (Queens University of Belfast), Aimee Kanner Arias (Florida Atlantic University), and Anna van der Vleuten (Radboud University Nijmegen). While Duina and Marshall concentrated on the receiving end of policy adaption through legal compliance, Arias’ paper aimed at understanding to what extent Latin American’s policies to promote social cohesion were adopted from the EU. Finally, van der Vleuten presented an ambitious project that tried to answer the question whether, and if so successfully, the EU tried to promote gender equality in SADC.

In the third panel, Kathleen Hancock (Colorado School of Mines) asked which role the EU has played in the South African Customs Union (SACU): advocate, cajoler, or bully? She emphasized the fact that the SACU has been around from 100 years and therefore its creation was not motivated by EU influence. Also in the third panel, Osvaldo Saldias (Humboldt University Berlin) addressed the “transplantation” of the European Court of Justice to other regions. Saldias questioned when one legal system, such as the Andean Tribunal of Justice, borrows from another, whether there is a specific demand, condition, or setting for transplants which would make them more likely in any given region.

During panel four, a cross-regional comparison was envisaged. All papers approached regionalism differently (deductively, inductively and from a historical perspective). As one example Sebastian Krapohl (University of Bamberg) presented a study that explained differences in regional integration with different economic structures. The presentations showed, that many theories exist which do not communicate well with each other.

In the fifth panel, Mikhail Molchanov and Vera Molchanova (St. Thomas University; Sochi Research Centre of the Russian Academy of Sciences) asked whether Eurasia could be considered a region, as Russian is a common language between many of the Eurasian countries. They then asked what Eurasian regionalism might look like and whether any attempts at such regionalism exist. The findings suggested that, although attempts at regionalism have been made, there have been many more failures than successes.

The last panel focused on an apparent exception in regional integration: despite the high degree of economic interdependence in North East Asia, there is little institutionalization of it. Presentations by scholars from the region tried to illuminate the

Asian integration by looking at security and economic cooperation. The findings stimulated discussions on whether the same theoretical assumptions and categories are applicable for researching regional integration in Asia.

Much of the discussions centered around issues of methodology in researching the diffusion of regional integration. Tanja Börzel (KFG) and Alex Warleigh-Lack (Brunel University), argued that power-based theories still informed many studies on the diffusion of regional integration. Thomas Risse (KFG) contended that functional approaches have, so far, been the strongest explanatory power, although they cannot account for institutional outcomes. Another issue of contention was the degree of “euro-centralism” and the search for better methods for comparisons across different regions.

In a roundtable discussion Stephen Clarkson

(University of Toronto), Richard T. Griffiths (Leiden University), Philippe de Lombaerde (United Nations University, Brugge), Timothy Shaw (The University of the West Indies, St. Augustine), and Alex Warleigh-Lack (Brunel University) reasoned whether the main unit of analysis in comparative regionalism should be the “state” or rather a “pair of states,” with the understanding that both lead to quite different types of research questions. Also, a concern was raised as to how a comparison can be drawn from different models, such as the EU, when such models are under a constant state of evolution.

The main purpose of the conference was to engage students of comparative regionalism from different disciplines in a discussion about whether different outcomes in the diffusion of regional integration can be explained by different mechanisms..

Impressions



Conference Report

“Faraway so Close? Reaching beyond the Pro/Contra Controversy of Turkey’s EU Accession”

Conference held on February 3-5, 2011
by Bilgin Ayata

Workshop Convenors



Dr. Bilgin Ayata

Dr. Banu Karaca

In recent years, there has been a visible increase in the scholarship on Turkey’s EU accession. In contrast to the current state of the accession negotiations, the controversy about if, when, why and how Turkey should join the EU continues to stir up heated discussions in the European public and in academic fora. This is not too surprising, given that Turkey’s accession indeed poses a number of challenges to the EU and the political and socio-cultural construction of “Europe”. Yet, the polarization of the debate into a “pro vs. contra Turkey’s EU membership” - which ever so often frames the discourse on the topic - has become increasingly repetitive and is not moving the discussion forward.

Bilgin Ayata (post-doctoral fellow at the KFG) and Banu Karaca (Sabanci University) jointly organized a two-tier conference. The first part was hosted by the KFG in Berlin, with the primary aim to bring together junior and senior scholars from Europe and Turkey to search for fresh and innovative approaches. The first conference identified three core themes: 1) historical and comparative analysis of EU-Turkey debates; 2) the role of im/migration and 3) norm diffusion and minority rights. In the call for papers, an interdisciplinary conversation including scholars from neighboring disciplines was encouraged.

After an overwhelming response, 22 papers were selected for the conference that took place from February 3- 5, 2011. Scholars from a broad range of disciplines, from law to literature, came together in six panels. The conference began with around 50 participants that included members of the KFG community as well as scholars from the larger university network of the Berlin-Brandenburg area. The first panel “Revisiting Controversies on the European Union-Historical Inquiries” featured a political scientist and two historians - Daniel Thomas (University College Dublin), Mehmet Dösemeci (EUI Florence) and Martin Rempe (KFG Berlin) - whose thought-provoking contributions on controversies in the early years of European integration provided an excellent starting point for the conference. Eva Heidbreder (Hertie School of Governance, Berlin), a former fellow of the KFG, served both as chair and discussant. The second panel “Re-examining Discourses on Civilizational Difference” consisted of two sociologists, Ates Altinordu (Sabanci University) and Meltem Ahiska (Bosphorus University) and an anthropologist, Banu Karaca (Sabanci University). Their presentations critically interrogated the discourses on Turkey’s otherness - be they constructed culturally or religiously. The conference participants continued their exchange during the lunch break and reconvened for the next panel on “The Role of Im/migration in the Turkish Accession Debate” that smoothly built upon the previous panel. The innovative contributions by Ayhan Kaya (Bilgi University) and Ulrik Pram Gad (University of Copenhagen) highlighted the relevance of Turkish (or Muslim) immigrants in the EU for the debate of Turkey’s accession. The last panel of the first day “Contingent Rhetorics in and about Europe: Examining Euro-skepticism and Turco-skepticism” featured presentations by Beken Saatcioglu (Institute for European Integration Research, Vienna), Can Büyükbay

(University of Zürich) and Anna Herranz Surrealles (Institute Barcelona d'Estudis Internacionals) who offered insights both into euro-skepticism in Turkish political parties as well as the skepticism in EU institutions and the European public sphere towards Turkey's EU accession.

The second day focused on developments and policy reforms in Turkey: the first panel "Europe anization=Democratization? Questions of Norms, Conditionality and Harmonization" with papers by legal scholar Özgür Heval Cinar (University of Essex), political scientists Stefan Engert (J. W. Goethe University, Frankfurt), Isik Özel (Sabanci University), and Ceren Zeynep Ak (Queen Mary University of London) examined a wide variety of issues ranging from conscientious objection to energy regulation in Turkey in light of EU accession. Despite the range of topics, the discussant Tatjana Skripka succeeded in highlighting the common thread of the papers. The final panel "Minority Rights Reforms: Discourses, Policies

and Practices" featured political scientist Ioannis Grigoriadis (Bilkent University), political sociologist Cuma Cicek (Institute des Etudes Politiques de Paris), comparative literature specialist Efe Cakmak (Columbia University), political scientist Ömer Tekdemir (Durham University) and Digidem Soyaltin (KFG Berlin) and Gözde Yilmaz (KFG Berlin) as discussants. The papers examined minority rights in Greece and Turkey, and the impact of the EU on the Kurdish issue.

After two days of vibrant discussion, the conference ended with a brainstorming session on future themes to focus on in the second part of the conference in Istanbul. To make the presentations accessible to the global community of scholars, we have provided a podcast of the conference that includes all presentations. This podcast can be accessed at http://www.polsoz.fu-berlin.de/en/v/transformeurope/news/events/report_teuc_2011.html. Stay tuned for the second part of the conference in June 2011 in Istanbul!

Impressions



Call for Papers

“Mapping Agency. Comparing Regionalism in Sub-Saharan Africa”

Workshop to be held on July 7-8, 2011

Workshop Convenors



Dr. des. Ulrike Lorenz



Dr. Martin Rempé

Although regionalism has developed into a global phenomenon, it is often enough treated as a distinct ‘European idea’. Despite long-standing theoretical disputes between disciplines, academic work still tends to present the EU as ‘promoter’ of the ‘idea of regionalism’, regional initiatives are examined in terms of being shaped by EU policies and regional institutions are measured against the model of the EU. Such a Eurocentric approach tends to view other actors than the EU as rather passive ‘receiving ends’ while it neglects the active participation of a multiplicity of actors and their agency in respective processes.

Particularly in the case of Sub-Saharan Africa, little is actually known about domestic, regional and external actors and factors shaping formal as well as informal processes of regionalism. While theoretical work has increasingly paid attention to this topic over the last years, research is often weak on empirical insights. Against this backdrop, the workshop emphasizes an African perspective on regionalism in Sub-Saharan Africa, and particularly focuses on

three dimensions:

We would firstly like to highlight the historical dimension of such processes: We believe that current problems, successes, conflicts and failures of regionalisms in Sub-Saharan Africa can only be fully understood if their emergence and development over time is taken into account.

We are, secondly, interested in grasping and assessing domestic, regional and external actors engaging in regionalisms in Sub-Saharan Africa and their role in processes of regionalism. Which state and non-state actors foster or hamper regionalisms? To which extent are non-African actors trying to influence processes of regionalism in Sub-Saharan Africa? We are particularly interested in the build-up and the implementation of formal and informal processes.

Thirdly, we would like to stimulate a comparative perspective on different Africa regionalism approaches and schemes in order to develop a clearer picture on divergences, diversities, but also commonalities of processes of regionalisms in Sub-Saharan Africa.

The workshop aims at bringing together scholars working from an African perspective beyond disciplinary divides in order to map agency of and in regionalisms in Sub-Saharan Africa more comprehensively. We welcome paper abstracts for empirically rich papers from both junior and senior researchers of area studies, history, political science and neighboring disciplines that focus on at least one of the three dimensions. Abstracts of no more than 350 words should be sent until 15 March 2011 to mappingagency@gmail.com. Travel and accommodation funding can be provided.

LSEE-KFG Research Workshop

“Environmental Governance in South East Europe and the Western Balkans: The Transformative Power of Europe?”

Workshop to be held on May 6, 2011

Speakers & Programme

Keynote speakers:

Prof. Liliana Andonova - Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies, Geneva

Prof. Miranda Schreurs - Freie Universitat Berlin

Prof. Tanja Borzel - Freie Universitat Berlin

Other speakers:

Dr. Matthew Gorton - University of Newcastle, UK

Dr. Adam Fagan - Queen Mary, University of London / LSEE

Dr. Cristina Parau - University of Oxford

Dr. Aron Buzogany - German Research Institute for Public Administration, Speyer

Dr. Claudiu Craciun - SNSPA, Bucharest

Prof. Mina Petrović - University of Belgrade

Draft Workshop Programme:

You may download the programme [here](#) (PDF - 122 kB).



Establishing effective environmental governance across the new member and contender states of South

Eastern Europe represents one of the most complex challenges for the EU. In terms of the prospects of future enlargement, and the continued transformative power of Europe, the environmental perspective provides an invaluable empirical and conceptual vantage point to consider whether lessons of previous enlargements have been learnt; to assess the implementation of soft, non-binding forms of regulation; to examine the realities of weak states and limited statehood; and to consider the extent to which limited success, or indeed outright failure, will impact upon the normative authority of the EU. In addition, the nexus of Europeanization, environmental regulation and energy security

provides an interesting perspective from which to consider whether EU regulation and conditionality remain relevant in the context of significant non-EU (Russian) investment in regional energy sectors.

At the level of domestic politics, not only is formal compliance with the environmental acquis extremely costly and administratively burdensome, but effective implementation ultimately depends upon radical new forms of governance and interaction. Perhaps more than any other policy area, success is contingent upon governments engaging local as well as trans-national non-state actors and fostering regional co-operation in order to respond positively to global agendas on climate change, global warming and a reduction in GHGs. The extent to which the Commission is effectively driving environmental governance within South

Eastern Europe and the Western Balkans also offers a valuable optic on the capacity of the EU to act as the key global player in driving climate change governance.

This workshop aims to bring together scholars and practitioners, both within Western Europe and the region, working on aspects of environmental governance and regulation in new member states (Bulgaria and Romania as well as CEE states), and candidate and potential candidate states within the region (Albania, Montenegro, FYROM, BiH, Serbia and Croatia). Comparative papers and perspectives are particularly welcome, as are contributions focusing on institutional as well as network analysis,

or multi-level governance.

The specific aims of the workshop are: (i) to map and critically analyse emergent regional and inter-state co-operation; (ii) to examine the impact of Europeanization via enlargement on environmental governance (institutions and networks) in the context of weak civil societies and limited statehood; (iii) to critically assess the extent to which new forms of multilateral governance and regulation are emerging within the region; (iv) to consider “local” environmental regulation and regional responses in the context of energy sector development, climate change and ‘global’ trans-national environmental agendas and initiatives.

OVERVIEW: LATEST WORKING PAPERS

KOLLEG-FORSCHERGRUPPE "THE TRANSFORMATIVE POWER OF EUROPE"

All Working Paper may be downloaded [here](#)

Working Paper NO. 19

How European is European Identity? Extent and Structure of Continental Identification in Global Comparison Using SEM

Jochen Roose - November 2010

Abstract: European identification has been previously explained by the selective gains brought by the European integration process, by personal transnational experiences and by the influence of political programs aiming at increasing levels of identification. All these explanations imply that identification with one's continent would be specific in extent and distribution across the social structure in comparison to other continents. These implicit assumptions of the discussion are tested with a global comparison using International Social Service Programme (ISSP) data and a longitudinal analysis using Eurobarometer data. The results show that, firstly, the current extent of continental identification in Europe is not higher than in other continents. Secondly, they reveal that there has been no increase in European identification in recent decades and thirdly, group comparing structural equation modeling (SEM) shows, that distribution of continental identification is similar on all continents. Accordingly, explaining European identification with respect to policy output of the EU is questioned by the findings. European identification proves to be independent of European political integration. Conclusions for transnational identity research and the European integration process are discussed.

Working Paper NO. 20

Networks, Courts and Regional Integration. Explaining the Establishment of the Andean Court of Justice.

Oswaldo Saldías - November 2010

Abstract: Legal transplants have traditionally been believed to be the product of reason and informed decision-making that follow arduous deliberations and bargaining between lawmakers. This paper argues that some major legal transformations can be better explained with the help of networks. It delves into the history of the establishment of the Andean Court of Justice and asks who got to decide the major questions in regard to the institutional

design of the court. I argue that contrary to dominant assumptions, consultants and think tanks play a decisive role in the shaping of legal transplants. They are the ones that decide which model to follow. They get to choose participants in relevant working groups and it is them who shape the final proposal that will be voted by the lawmaker. As the complexity of the topic increases, professional networks can use technical discourse that makes scrutiny unlikely. The research shows that in case of Andean regional integration, the personal background of consultant is also very relevant, because it determines what models will be considered for eventual benchmarking. However, the mere existence of networks is not enough for producing legal change; a window of opportunity is a necessary condition.

Working Paper NO. 21

Democracy and Legitimacy in the European Union Revisited: Input, Output and Throughput.

Vivien Schmidt - November 2010

Abstract: Whether their analytic frameworks focus on institutional form and practices or on its interactive construction, scholars have analyzed the EU's democratic legitimacy mainly in terms of the trade-offs between the output effectiveness of EU's policies outcomes for the people and the input participation by and representation of the people. Missing is theorization of the "throughput" efficiency, accountability, transparency, and openness to consultation with the people of the EU's internal governance processes. The paper argues that adding this analytic category facilitates assessment of these legitimizing mechanisms' interdependencies and facilitates consideration of reforms that could turn this democratic trilemma into a "virtuous circle".

Working Paper NO. 22

Patterns of Power. The EU's External Steering Techniques at Work - The Case of Democratization Policies in Morocco

David Budde, Mathias Großklaus - December 2010

Abstract: This paper conceptualizes a framework of political steering that includes modern conceptions of power as formulated by Foucault, Habermas, Bourdieu and others and applies it to the empirical analysis of the EU neighborhood policies. Analyzing the promotion of human rights and democracy as part of a comprehensive security strategy in Morocco since 2003, the authors scrutinize the use and the resonance of hierarchic, indirect and soft steering modes in EU external governance in the Southern Mediterranean. The findings suggest that Europe employs a complex strategy that targets governing officials, civil society actors and society at large, each with a respective mix of steering modes. Whereas classic incentives failed to initiate reforms at the government level, they proved effective in empowering Moroccan civil society actors. Soft modes are shown to play a decisive role in shaping the self-image of the administration officials vis-à-vis the EU and the parameters of public discourse on human rights and democracy, thus allowing for non-governmental actors to encroach on the government and demand democratic reforms. The integrated perspective on steering mechanisms in EU neighborhood policies thereby reveals the need to further explore micro-techniques of power in external governance analysis.

Working Paper NO. 23

Is There a Puzzle? Compliance with Minority Rights in Turkey (1999-2010)

Gözde Yılmaz - January 2011

Abstract: The Helsinki Summit in 1999 represents a turning point for EU-Turkey relations. Turkey gained status as a formal candidate country for the EU providing a strong incentive to launch democratic reforms for the ultimate reward of membership. Since 2001, the country has launched a number of reforms in minority rights. Many controversial issues, such as denial of the existence of the Kurds, or the lack of property rights granted to non-Muslim minorities in the country, have made progress. Even though the reforms in minority rights may represent a tremendous step for the Europeanization process of Turkey, the compliance trend in minority rights is neither progressive nor smooth. While there is a consensus within the literature about the acceleration of reforms starting in 2002 and the slow down by 2005 in almost all policy areas, scholars are divided into two camps regarding the continuing slow down of the reform process or the revival of the reforms since 2008. I argue, in the present paper,

that the compliance process with minority rights in Turkey is puzzling due to the differentiated outcome and the recent revival of behavioral compliance. I aim to shed light on the empirical facts in the least-likely area for reform in the enlargement process. Through a detailed analysis of minority-related reform process of Turkey being an instance of ongoing compliance, the paper contributes to the literature divided on the end result of Europeanization in the country recently.

Working Paper NO. 24

Policy Matters But How? Explaining Non-Compliance Dynamics in the EU

Tanja A. Börzel, Tobias Hofmann and Diana Panke - February 2011

Abstract: The European Union's infringement procedure is highly legalized. Nevertheless, as in other international institutions, non-compliance occurs on a regular basis and its transformation into compliance varies across EU infringement stages and over time. State of the art compliance literature focuses mainly on country-specific explanations, such as power, capacity, and legitimacy. In particular power-capacity models explain a good part of whether non-compliance occurs and how quickly it can be resolved. Yet, these approaches leave substantial parts of the empirical variation that we observe unexplained. This paper argues that policy and, in particular, rule-specific variables – although often neglected – are important for explaining non-compliance. Based on a quantitative analysis, we show that policy matters not only for the frequency with which EU law is violated, but also the persistence of non-compliance over time and over the different stages of the infringement procedure.

Working Paper NO. 25

Decision-Making in Security and Defence Policy. Towards Supranational Intergovernmentalism?

Jolyon Howorth - March 2011

Abstract: For scholars and practitioners of European politics alike, the distinction between supranationalism and intergovernmentalism has always been fundamental. This distinction has underpinned the various schools of European integration theory, just as it has remained crucial for European governments keen to demonstrate that the member states remain in charge of key policy areas. Nowhere is this considered to be more central than in the area of foreign and security policy, which has consciously been set within the rigid intergovernmental framework of Pillar Two of the Maastricht Treaty and, under the Lisbon Treaty, remains subject to the unanimity rule. And yet, scholarship on the major decision-making agencies of the foreign and security policy of the EU suggests that the distinction is not only blurred but increasingly meaningless. This paper demonstrates that, in virtually every case, decisions are shaped and even taken by small groups of relatively well-socialized officials in the key committees acting in a mode which is as close to supranational as it is to intergovernmental. The political control of foreign and security policy, which is considered sacrosanct by member state governments, is only rarely exercised by politicians at the level of the European Council or Council of Ministers.