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(Re)Integrating Gender
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Workshop panel 1: Framing the Issues: From unintended consequences to (re)integrating gender

“The gendered (un)intentionality of EU policy” European Integration online Papers
Elaine Weiner & Heather MacRae

“Unintended gender effects of demographic and economic crises in the EU’ Journal of Social Policy
Heather MacRae & Elaine Weiner

In these special issues, we strive to re-envision prevailing theoretical and methodological treatments of public policy’s gendering (and lack thereof), using the European Union (EU) as case study. A widely recognized trend-setter in the promotion of gender equality, the EU relies on both hard law and soft law (e.g., gender mainstreaming) measures to advance economic, political and social equality between men and women. A formidable literature has focused on the EU’s gender equality agenda; however, much of the attention has centered on two particular policy arenas – employment and social policy – where well-established, longstanding gender inequities in employment and social welfare have provoked policy reforms intended to rectify such inequalities. Such policies, founded in the presumption of inequality in these realms, are explicitly gendered, invoking gender equality in their formulated intent. For instance, the EU mandates that all member states legislatively ensure equal treatment of men and women in matters of social security. There are, however, a vast array of policy spheres such as defense, climate change and development that have not inspired significant challenge as to their gendered intent. While gender mainstreaming seeks to consider gendered intent at policy inception, the bulk of these policy realms are considered to be gender-neutral in their intent. This collection of works shifts the focus to unintentional gendered outcomes, engaging the broad range of EU policy arenas, in a critical effort to refine our analytic tool kit.

Workshop panel 2: Understanding crisis and growth

Gendering European economic narratives: Assessing the costs of the crisis to gender equality
Dr Roberta Guerrina, University of Surrey

The research agenda that has emerged around the Eurocrisis has focused primarily on sovereign debt as a test for the political commitment of member states to the European project. While a discourse of austerity has become the dominant narrative of the decade, related questions about the impact of social inclusion and gender equality have largely gone unanswered by mainstream political commentators with grave consequences for the advancement of (substantive) gender equality in Europe. There are unintended consequences of austerity, and potentially serious implications for the future of the European social model. This article applies a gender lens to the current economic crisis, the austerity measures surrounding it and the discourse in which this is encased.

Paper 2 TBC.
Workshop panel 3: Mainstreaming

The unintended consequences of mainstreaming gender in EU research policies
Dr Emanuela Lombardo, Madrid Computense University, Spain and Dr Lut Mergaert, Yellow Window Management Consultants, Belgium

The ‘unintended’ and ineffective implementation of gender mainstreaming in EU research policy will be explored through the theoretical framework of ‘resistant institutions.’ Drawing on examples of different types and forms of resistance within DG Research and Innovation, we will show how the approach to gender mainstreaming was significantly shrunk in the course of the European Commission FP6, both in terms of discourses and policy measures. We argue that there exist tensions between the European Commission’s official mandate – the ‘intended’ mainstreaming of gender equality into all policies - and its actual implementation – the ‘unintended’ policy evaporation of transformative gender equality goals.

Gender mainstreaming and cross-sectoral policy-making: Policy coherence for development and the global approach to migration
Dr Gill Allwood, Nottingham Trent University, UK

Using a combination of process-tracing and critical frame analysis, this article examines gender mainstreaming within two frameworks for coordinating policy across sectors and across institutional structures. These are Policy Coherence for Development and the Global Approach to Migration. It therefore extends the analysis of gender mainstreaming to areas not always perceived to be gendered, but also asks what happens to gender mainstreaming once policy sectors interact. It finds that gender tends to slip off the agenda as the result of a combination of institutional resistance and competition from other cross-cutting issues.

Workshop panel 4: Enduring challenges for gender research in European studies

Pregnancy, maternity and parental rights in Europe: Between gaps and good practices
Assoc. Prof Annick Masselot, University of Canterbury, New Zealand

National statutory rights relating to the protection of pregnancy, maternity and parenthood across the EU Member States are generally of a reasonable standard. The EU has successfully established a common ground and often domestic legal provisions go well beyond their obligations. Despite extensive legislation, pregnant women and new parents continue to experience high levels of discrimination and difficulties, because there appears to be a large gap between the letter of the law and its practice. In addition, cultural stereotypes are still very much alive across Europe and women are still perceived as the main carers and therefore not primarily as workers with full employment rights. Employers generally argue that more entitlement to pregnancy and maternity rights leads to more discrimination against women, while parents claim that more protections and more rights are required in order for them to be able to access and retain paid employment. It has been suggested that the extent of pregnancy and maternity rights is directly linked by the existence of rights or that women are discriminated against because rights are too burdensome for employers. This paper explores the tension that exists between the letter of the law and the existing gaps in practice. It raises issues of harmful gender stereotypes and questions the usefulness of the law.

Maintaining gender blindness: Linking implementation outcomes to the evolution of the EU
Dr Rosalind Cavaghan, University of Edinburgh

The EU often tries to portray commitment to gender equality as a fundamental value within a unique EU identity (MacRae 2005, Wobbe 2003) pointing to the developed suite of policy commitments to equal opportunities and gender mainstreaming (GM), embedded within multiple recent Treaties. Empirical analysis of these commitments however has indicated disappointing implementation results. Numerous analyses have found that commitments to gender equality are often ignored or subordinated to other policy aims, particularly economic ones (Pollack & Hafner-Burton 2000, Rubery 2003). Our understanding of how these outcomes come about during implementation remains limited however, in part due to the methodological difficulties of operationalising complex theories of the construction of gender within local contexts (e.g. Acker 1990, Connell 1990, see Lovenduski 2005). This paper provides an empirical analysis of the implementation processes constituting limited GM implementation in the European Commission using the sociology of knowledge (Callon/Latour 1981) and drawing on recent critical policy frame analyses methodologies (Verloo 2007). These
methods enable an analysis which shows the links between the EU’s Treaties, strategic policies and daily working practices, illustrating how they form the gender blind field within which GM implementation must be negotiated, presenting barriers to the successful implementation of GM

Workshop panel 5: New research agendas

**Gender ESDP and NATO**
Katharine Wright, University of Surrey

**Political participation and representation of East European migrants**
Katarina Zajacova, University of Surrey
WORKSHOP 2

Studying Euroscepticism

Organiser: Dr Nathalie Brack, Université libre de Bruxelles, Belgium

EU politics is no longer an elite-driven process, and the role of public opinion has become a determinant in shaping its agenda. The question of what determines public support for the EU and euroscepticism has been widely examined in the literature. However, over time, the range of response to the EU and the European project has become much wider and more multifaceted. Currently, the economic and financial crisis triggers new forms of contestation and anti-European attitudes. At a time when European integration faces a crisis with multiple dimensions, it is important to consider the resistances engendered by this process not only at the domestic level, but also within the European institutions; not only among political parties and leaders but also among citizens, interest groups and the media. It is also critical to understand this phenomenon in a broader perspective and question whether there is something unique about euroscepticism or if it is part of a broader trend of polity opposition that could be found in any democracy.

This workshop proposes to understand this wide range of responses, usually labelled as eurosceptic and provide a conceptual framework aimed to grasp the complexity and diversity of these oppositions. As euroscepticism has become a ‘persistent’ (Usherwood and Startin 2012) and embedded part of the integration process:

- Is the label euroscepticism still appropriate for providing a conceptual framework or has it rather become part of the problem in understanding the complexity of the situation?
- Is there something unique about euroscepticism and if so, is there something in the EU itself that fosters this phenomenon or is it part of a broader trend that can then be compared with other forms of anti-systemness and polity contestation?

The workshop is part of the UACES Research network on Euroscepticism. We expect a publication of the papers from the workshop, either as a journal special issue or an edited book.

Participants:

- Nathalie Brack, Université libre de Bruxelles, Belgium
- Simona Guerra, Leicester University, UK
- Nicholas Startin, Bath University, UK
- John Fitzgibbon, Canterbury Christ Church University, UK
- Clément Jadot, Université libre de Bruxelles, Belgium
- Petr Kaniok and Vlít Hlousek, Masaryk University, Czech Republic
PANEL 1

The economic crisis, rising China and the EU

Panel convenor: Dr Maria Garcia, University of Nottingham, UK

Panel abstract:

Sino-European relations form one side of the triangle USA-EU-China that dominates trade flows and many global events. The continuing financial and economic crisis besiegling the Western economies, and to a lesser extent the emerging ones, has brought the importance of China for Europe even more to the fore. The aim of this panel is to explore how the crisis and China's rise are reshaping the values and context of the international and how it is affecting relations between these two powers in terms of in terms of their relative power vis-à-vis one another, their mutual perceptions, their ability to cooperate to overcome the crisis, but also the competitive aspects of their relationship. Whilst the main focus of cooperation and competition in the shadow of the crisis is on economic relations as reflected in trade and investment flows and trade disputes, this is but one aspect of the ongoing attempts at creating a genuine strategic partnership amongst both parties. Crises management, the green economy and climate change, development offer avenues for cooperation for these powers, and even potential collaborations that could also encourage some future economic growth, but are they being used effectively? As China's new leadership re-directs its efforts internally to deal with increasing social disparities within the Asian giant, and as European leaders' time and energy is spent on internal matters, the question arises of what the relationship might look like in the future. Papers analyse the rise of China and power shift to China, as well as the EU's conflicted strategy towards China at the macro-level, and also analyses at the micro-level the interaction between competition and cooperation in trade and energy.

Power shift to the East? American hegemony and China's ascent in times of global financial & monetary crises (from a European perspective)
Marc Verhaus, Freie Universitaet Berlin, Germany

For six decades the US has sustained a hegemonic position in the global financial/monetary order based on: 1) institutional power (control over outcomes in the IMF), 2) structural power (Dollar/Wall-Street dominance) and 3) ideational power (Neoliberalism as the leading politico-economic ideology - especially since the 1970s). This has served the country's interests whereas other nations have been forced to shoulder most of the burdens of adjustment. The sovereign debt crisis of 2008 (as a critical juncture) laid bare the deficiencies of the US-centred order and the vulnerability of the indebted and economically stuttering hegemon, and opened a window of opportunity for its main rival: liquidity-rich China. Beijing is now starting to contest the US by: 1) increasing its influence within the IMF, 2) extending the international role and convertibility of the renminbi and establishing Shanghai as a global financial centre and 3) following a Neo-Mercantilist approach which characterised by gradual financial liberalization and an accumulation of monetary reserves. What results from these highly significant transformative processes is not only the question how Europe should/can position itself but also if it (especially by means of the crisis-ridden Euro as a proclaimed global currency) can play a significant role at all.

Does the EU's really have a strategy towards China?
Dr Tomasz Kamiński, University of Lodz, Poland

This paper examines the EU's negotiations of a Partnership and Cooperation Agreement with China within the aegis of the EU's so-called Strategic Partnership with China. It analyses the partnership, within the context of the EU's broader and ill-defined Strategic Partnerships, and questions whether the institutional set-up, rationale, and evolution of the relationship can really be seen as reflecting a well-conceived long-term European strategy towards China.

Disputes and counter-disputes: The EU, China, and lost opportunities for collaboration in 'green economy' and crisis recovery?
Dr Maria Garcia, University of Nottingham, UK

The first months following China's leadership handover in November 2012 have brought little change to Sino-European relations. Trade and investment relations, a mainstay of the relationship over past decades, have continued to solidify despite the financial crisis in Europe. Instead, they have led to an increased importance of China as a market and a source of inward investment. This paper delves deeper into one aspect of this complex and varied relationship, the current WTO disputes brought by the EU and China against one other in
photovoltaic panels, and telecommunications equipment. The paper firsts positions these against the context of other EU-China disputes and their broader economic relationship. It then uses materials from interviews with officials and business representatives, media, and official documents to process-trace the decision to interpose these disputes. Focusing on the underlying interests behind these disputes, the paper relates to the literature on interests and lobbying in trade policy, as well as Sino-European economic relations. The paper shows that the divergent interests over time cause fractures within the EU that weaken its position vis-à-vis China. It also suggests avenues for greater cooperation to further achieve EU and Chinese ‘green economy’ efforts, which the current disputes risk undermining.
PANEL 2
Governance of public health nutrition policies – the case of harmonisation of food policies at the EU level

Co-convenors: Dr Lada Timotijevic and Prof Monique Raats
Food Consumer Behaviour and Health Research Centre, University of Surrey, UK

The EU food policy has gone through substantial changes over the past several decades, partly triggered by the emergence of food scares, the developments in food science and innovation (novel foods) and public distrust of European institutions (Bergeaud-Blacker and Ferretti, 2006). The key impetus to these changes has been reforming food safety governance processes. It is only recently that public health nutrition agenda has come to the fore of the EU food policy. Whilst harmonisation of food policy has been an important part of EU food regulation, the recent shift has been away from harmonisation in the name of free trade, towards harmonisation for public and consumer health promotion. Thus, harmonisation is seen less as a vehicle for free trade and advancement of economic policies, and increasingly as a prerequisite for health policy development, as it will: enable better monitoring of diets and nutrient profiles of products, thus helping scientific and policy effort to relate nutrient intake to health status and outcomes; achieve more synchronised sets of policy instruments developed to enable healthier diet of EU consumers (e.g. food labelling or health claims); enable more transparent and effective linkages between science and policy, through harmonised processes of data collection, evidence evaluation and its application to EU-relevant policy domain. Such a shift is not without its challenges. First, food regulation has been historically located within the national legislative and regulatory domain whilst food as a domain cuts across a range of sectors. At the EU level, there was a need for a new institutional architecture capable of managing food policies as an agenda for health (traditionally confined to economic and business regulatory mechanisms). This has been accompanied by the advent of consumer power (increased consumer engagement with food policies and organised critique of some of its common policies) and “risk management” as a new rationale for food governance. This has resulted in a more complex food governance landscape characterised by a patchwork of legal and regulatory instruments spanning different levels of governance as well as policy domains such as business and innovation, health, consumer protection and science regulation.

The founding of the Food Consumer Behaviour and Health Research Centre (University of Surrey) in 2000 coincided with these tectonic shifts in food policy development and delivery at the EU as well as national levels. Through its focus upon consumer behaviour and public health nutrition policies, the FCBH has examined the processes and potential for harmonisation within a range of domains relevant to food governance for health, such as: food composition data; nutrient reference values; nutrition labelling policy, nutrition and health claims, dietary guidelines (e.g. Food Based Dietary Guidelines) and other nutritional recommendations (e.g. early feeding recommendations). Although these various research objectives occupy different points in the process of public health nutrition policy development and application, there are several common features that unify these projects: a) the explicit links and pervasive interaction between science and policy within the governance of each of these domains; b) the multi-sectoral and complex institutional architecture governing the domain; c) the strong focus upon consumer behaviour. The current workshop will give an overview of the work of the FCBH on public health nutrition-related harmonisation processes in Europe, with a special focus upon the following domains: food composition data; nutrient reference values; front-of-pack nutrition labelling and food based dietary guidelines. The workshop will summarise the potential for and particular challenges of harmonisation within each of these domains, and provide theoretical reflection on the value and limitations of achieving a common public health nutrition policy in Europe.

Paper 1: Micronutrient recommendation stakeholders’ beliefs on dietary guidelines: A qualitative study across six European countries/regions
Kerry A Brown

A range of stakeholders have been involved in the development and implementation of dietary guidelines across European Union member states. Seventy-seven semi-structured qualitative interviews explored stakeholders’ beliefs of dietary guidelines in six European countries/regions. A main theme variation in the interpretation of the term dietary guideline was identified using thematic analysis. Descriptions of dietary guidelines varied across stakeholder groups and countries. Reference was made to both food-based and nutrient-based guidelines including the terms food-based dietary guidelines and food guides (e.g. pyramids), nutrient recommendations, dietary recommendations, dietary reference values and guideline daily amounts. The terminology surrounding dietary guidelines requires greater clarity. Until that time, stakeholders would benefit from greater awareness of potential misinterpretations and the implications of this on multi-stakeholder, multi-national policy development and implementation.
Paper 2: The process of setting micronutrient recommendations: A cross-European comparison of nutrition-related scientific advisory bodies
Dr Lada Timotijevic, University of Surrey

The aim of the current paper is to examine the workings of the nutrition-related scientific advisory bodies in Europe, paying particular attention to the internal and external context within which they operate. Desk-research based on two data collection strategies was conducted: a questionnaire was completed by key informants across 35 European countries in the field of micronutrient recommendations; a case-study was carried out that focused upon mandatory folic acid (FA) fortification, focusing on 7 countries: UK; Norway; Denmark; Germany; Spain; Czech Republic; Hungary. The results suggested that varied bodies are responsible for setting micronutrient recommendations, each with different statutory and legal models of operation. Transparency is highest where there are standing scientific advisory committees (SAC). Where there is no dedicated SAC, the impetus for the development of micronutrient recommendations and the associated policies comes from interested specialists in the area. This is typically linked with an ad hoc selection of a problem area to consider, lack of openness and transparency of the decisions and overreliance upon international recommendations. Even when there is a consensus about the science behind micronutrient recommendations, there are a range of other influences that will affect decisions about the policy approaches to nutrition-related public health.

Paper 3: The importance of harmonizing food composition data across Europe
Dr Bernadette Egan, University of Surrey

Data on the nutritional composition of foods are essential for a broad spectrum of activities, including public health nutrition, research, the food industry and government policy development and implementation. With the expansion of the European Union and the concomitant increase in cross border trade and cooperation harmonizing food composition data becomes a more important issue than ever. Harmonization is not solely a technical issue, but also involves creating durable and sustainable structures to maintain the viability of the data. These are some of the issues currently being addressed by the European Food Information Resource Network of Excellence.

Charo Hodgkins, University of Surrey

Significant ongoing debate exists amongst stakeholders as to the best front-of-pack labelling approach and emerging evidence suggests that the plethora of schemes may cause confusion for the consumer. To gain a better understanding of the relevant psychological phenomena and consumer perspectives surrounding FoP labelling schemes and their optimal development a Multiple Sort Procedure study involving free sorting of a range of nutritional labels presented on cards was performed in four countries (n = 60). The underlying structure of the qualitative data generated was explored using Multiple Scalogram Analysis. Elicitation of categorisations from consumers has the potential to provide a very important perspective in this arena and results demonstrated that the amount of information contained within a nutrition label has high salience for consumers, as does the health utility of the label although a dichotomy exists in the affective evaluation of the labels containing varying degrees of information aggregation. Classification of exiting front-of-pack labelling systems on a proposed dimension of ‘directiveness’ leads to a better understanding of why some schemes may be more effective than others in particular situations or for particular consumers. Based on this research an enhanced hypothetical front-of-pack labelling scheme which combines both directive and non-directive elements is proposed.

Final commentary: Governance of public health nutrition policies
Prof Richard Shepherd, University of Surrey
Panel abstract:

There is consensus that EU’s role in a globalised world is a significant policy issue. In 2007 European Council declared that EU aims to shape globalization in the interests of EU citizens on the basis of common European values and principles. To this end, many internal EU policies have progressively developed an external dimension. These include trade, financial markets, sustainable development, climate change and energy, public procurement and global security and migration. There is also evidence that the external dimension of policies can be strategically used by the EU to shape/moderate reform in the context of the internal market. While increasingly attracting the attention of EU institutions, the interactions between the internal and external dimensions of EU policies remain under-researched.

Against this backdrop, this panel aims to shed light to the interplay of the internal/external dimension of EU policies. It addresses the questions:

- Can we talk about the Europeanization of these policy areas beyond the EU borders? What are the characteristics, mechanisms and effects of the external Europeanization process in these policy domains?
- How the internal and external dimensions of EU policies affect EU politics and ultimately EU’s capacity to shape globalization?

This panel aims at stimulating innovative reflections on theoretical and methodological approaches to the interactions of internal and external policies. The claim is that methodological innovations may be necessary in order to be able to grasp the internal/external dynamics of EU policymaking and politics. Evidence shows that the actual expansion of EU rules both inside and outside the EU borders follows a sectoral and issue specific logic rather than macro-institutional prerogatives. This suggests that an analytical shift from the level of country to the level of policy may be useful. The connection with transnational sectoral epistemic communities and advocacy coalitions at the international level may also be fruitful.

Europeanization beyond the EU borders through social trade policy: promoting core labour standards in developing countries

Dr Eleni Xiarchogiannopoulou, Université Libre de Bruxelles, Belgium

The paper aims to clarify the mechanisms of external Europeanization. Studies so far claim that the more distant a country is from the EU core, the more indirect the mechanisms of external Europeanization. The paper problematizes this claim. It follows Normal Accident Theory, as adapted in the area of EU studies. The paper focuses on the interactions of the web of actors found in this policy area. It hypothesises that the less complex and the more tightly linked actors are the more direct the mechanisms of external Europeanization.

SC is a ‘social’ trade policy instrument that the EU includes to its trade agreements with developing countries through the Generalised System of Preferences (GSP) in order to promote basic human rights, labour, sustainable development and good governance standards. The GSP is a trade policy programme that allows the exemption of developing countries from exports tariffs as a way of assisting their growth and development.

The European experience in multilevel governance of animal rights and the seal WTO case: Transfer of ideas or hindrance?

Dr Rike U. Kraemer, University College London, UK

In the realm of the WTO, the European Union can shape globalization in the negotiation processes for WTO agreements, e.g. the European Union tried to transfer the European state aid approach onto the WTO-Level. However, shaping agreements is not the only way for Europe to shape global politics in the WTO. Using the WTO Dispute Settlement Procedure is another possibility. The proposed legal paper first closely describes the
The European Seal Regime is challenged by Canada at the WTO. In a second step and by analysing the first written submission of the European Union, the paper asks the question whether the European internal experience in dealing with Seal hunting helps the EU to transfer their own ideas towards the WTO-level or whether it constrains the EU in arguing the case?

Credibility is in the eye of the beholder: Perception and effectiveness of political conditionality in EU enlargement and neighbourhood policies

Dr Tina Freyburg, University of Warwick and Prof Dr Solveig Richter, University of Erfurt, Germany

Existing studies demonstrate that EU political conditionality needs to be credible in order to have any impact. These studies define credibility from the perspective of the external agency, notably in terms of consistent application and precise definition of criteria. We argue that it is not the formal offer of rewards but the perception of its likely payment by the third country, which determines the credibility of conditionality and thus its effectiveness. Specifically, we contend that the recipient’s assessment of the credibility of incentives includes perceptive signals beyond the formal procedure, notably conflicting bilateral political interests of individual member states that may mediate the incentive effect. We empirically explore this argument by contrasting the perception of conditionality’s credibility in the enlargement policy and the Eastern neighbourhood policy. While Turkey has been formally offered the membership perspective as main incentive, the actual accession is not assessed as being credible. In turn, in Ukraine, in the first years after the Orange Revolution, the government self-imposed accession conditionality and anticipated to be finally rewarded with accession although no such an incentive has been formally offered by the EU. Taking domestic perceptions of credibility into account, this paper offers a new perspective on the effectiveness of conditionality in inducing compliance.
Panel convenor: Dr Sofia Vasilopoulou, University of York, UK

Panel abstract

The process of integrating Europe, accelerated at Maastricht and continuing ever since, has produced growing public and elite opposition. Concurrently with this development, scholarship on Euroscepticism has entered a particularly dynamic phase since the 1990s and literature on the topic is now abundant. Scholars have sought to conceptualize and ‘understand’ the phenomenon as well as ‘explain’ what causes it across Europe. However, despite the fact that Euroscepticism is by now a stable feature of European integration with significant influence on the substance and direction of EU and national politics and policy, the literature has yet to focus on the ‘impact’ of Euroscepticism. In normative terms, the embeddedness of Euroscepticism (Usherwood and Startin 2013) may influence our conception of democracy at both EU and national levels, our ideas with regard to the future of European integration, and our understanding of the accountability nexus between national elites, European publics and European elites. The two panels proposed here seek to address this gap by conceptualising, theorising and empirically examining the impact on Euroscepticism. The first panel (two papers) takes a predominantly theoretical perspective. The second panel (three papers) is concerned with specific cases studies.

Everyday politics of Euroscepticism and the European public sphere

Dr Markus Ketola, London School of Economics, UK

While in the academic debate the idea of a European public sphere is seen from both consensual and conflictual perspectives, in the field of European Union (EU) policymaking, it tends to assume the profile of a neutral and all-inclusive social space. This paper suggests that such a view is problematic because it fails to resonate with people’s everyday experiences of the EU, which include Euroscepticism. The paper demonstrates how EU policy on the development of a European public sphere, by failing to embrace conflict and diversity of opinions, is likely to fuel Eurosceptic sentiment in Europe. In order for the concept of a European public sphere to garner meaning outside the EU policy process, and for it to become a mechanism of democratisation at the European level, it needs to be anchored in the everyday politics of people’s experiences of Europe, especially where this leads to a Eurosceptic engagement. This means embracing an approach that is sensitive to difference, diversity, and conflict, and that is able to engage with multiple visions of the European public sphere, even one that is Eurosceptic.

The varied impact of Euroscepticism

Dr Sofia Vasilopoulou, University of York, UK

There is no doubt that a growing mood of scepticism has been increasingly characterising the ‘State of Europe’. Herman Van Rompuy, President of the European Council, told a Berlin audience in November 2010 that ‘Euroscepticism leads to war’, identifying the latter as Europe’s ‘biggest enemy’. The process of integrating Europe, accelerated at Maastricht and continuing ever since, has produced growing opposition, which has taken various forms and at times halted or delayed the project of a united Europe. Euroscepticism is a pervasive phenomenon: it resonates deeply with both the European publics and elites. If we may understand Euroscepticism as an increasingly ‘mainstream’ phenomenon, i.e. expressed by actors and institutions that hold political power and can influence politics in a direct fashion, then an analysis of its impact on the process of European integration, the direction of EU policy and domestic European politics may seem pertinent. This paper seeks to identify, conceptualise and theorise the ways in which Euroscepticism has (or has not) affected European integration and domestic European politics. It argues that although the impact of Euroscepticism on domestic politics is at best indirect or at worse limited, Euroscepticism is instrumental in structuring and framing the debate on Europe, and has to a large extent influenced the scope and direction of European integration both historically and contemporaneously.

British Euroscepticism: a more open EU?

Yilmaz Kaplan, University of York, UK

Globalization has put nation-states into a paradoxical situation; interdependence and transnationalization of many issues (e.g. companies, pollution, migration, and even identities) have pushed nation-states to develop international regimes/institutions to make the new global system more predictable and stable which are
needed by nation-states to survive; on the other hand, these international/regional regimes have come with new legitimacy sources at the expense of nation-states’ sovereignty. This paradoxical situation can easily be seen in the EU context. It could be even argued that ‘euroscepticism’ is used to explain this paradox. Although some of the EU members criticize supra-national character of the EU, they still continue to become EU members due to the afore-mentioned structural factors. In this context, at first glance, euroscepticism could simply be defined as a national reaction against globalization and as an inward-looking tendency. However, if the issue is studied a step further, some interesting points could be emerged. For example, British euroscepticism occupies a different place unlike the abovementioned general tendency. The focal point of British euroscepticism is that the EU locks Britain in Europe despite Britain’s global ambitions; and as a result of structural reasons, if Britain cannot give up its membership, it could be expected that Britain will force the EU to become more global and less regional. Therefore, this paper will argue that euroscepticism (particularly British euroscepticism) prevents the EU from becoming a land-locked regional system against globalization.

The ‘Danish’ version of Euroscepticism

Dr Tereza Horejsova, Charles University in Prague, Institute of International Studies, Czech Republic

Denmark is considered as one of the most Eurosceptic countries in the European Union. This perception emanates particularly from the fact that it has four opt-outs from EU co-operation, three of them in very significant areas of European integration (justice and home affairs, euro and parts of Common Foreign and Security Policy). Although Danish population is – in general – very positive in regard to the process of European integration (see Eurobarometer results), it has significant reservations to the political and supranational unification which has been continuously perceived as a threat to Danish statehood, nation-state and national identity. The paper asks whether certain national specifics pre-determine “the Danish” version of Euroscepticism. In previous academic research, it has not been very common to explore “national versions” of public Euroscepticism. However, current literature does not take into account the subtle nuances in demonstration and origins of Euroscepticism of each member state. The qualitative analysis of this paper leads us to believe that in the case of Denmark, the national specifics serve as roots of Danish Euroscepticism. Acknowledgment that national characteristics and specifics play a role in the features of public Euroscepticism may contribute to a more nuanced analysis of the hurdles and unwillingness of further European integration by individual member states.
**PANEL 5**

**Making the EU work**

*Convenor: Prof Alex Warleigh-Lack*

**The European Defence Agency and military capability development: making pooling and sharing work in the context of the financial crisis**  
_Dr Laura Chappell, University of Surrey, UK_

Despite the original rationale underlying CSDP, the EU’s focus has been on conflict prevention and crisis management. This paper discusses EU military capability development by analysing the work of the European Defence Agency and the prospects for practical development of pooling and sharing projects as envisaged by the Ghent Initiative in 2010. After the ill-conceived attempt by the member states to operationalise Permanent Structured Cooperation in Defence, whether significant change actually materialises will depend upon how the Pooling and Sharing initiative is implemented in practice. In the context of the financial crisis, several factors pose major challenges. The lack of sufficient political will to practically employ the Battlegroups, together with declining defence budgets and the unwillingness among the Member States to pool capabilities combines with the lack of a fully fledged European strategic culture in security and defence matters. By applying the concept of strategic culture this paper seeks to analyse these complex dynamics and uncover the possibilities for bringing a new impetus behind military capability development in the EU.

**How the European Union can ensure adequate protection of indigenous peoples’ rights in its policies**  
_Sanna Elfving, University of Surrey, UK_

This paper identifies a number of key issues that the European Union (EU) must take into account when dealing with indigenous peoples who are affected by the EU’s decision-making. In order to assess whether the EU policies adhere to the United Nations Declaration on Indigenous Peoples Rights, this paper investigates whether the EU policies aiming to protect seals from cruelty outside its borders unreasonably restricts the rights of Inuit of Canada to engage in their traditional economic activities, namely the sale of seal skins. Although it appears that the EU openly supports the rights of indigenous peoples under the UN Declaration, in reality the non-existence of open and accommodating dialogue between the EU and indigenous peoples has resulted in an inability for Inuit to put their rights into effect. Therefore, the EU must develop policies and processes which promote the protection of indigenous rights within Europe in line with international law. In order to help the legislative institutions of the EU in making better policies, this paper discusses simple consultation guidelines that could be put in place in order to guarantee adequate application of international law, considering that EU law requires the EU institutions maintain an open, transparent and regular dialogue with civil society and carry out broad consultations in order to ensure that the Union’s actions are coherent and transparent.

**Representative and participatory democracy in the EU after the Treaty of Lisbon**  
_Anastasia Karatzia, University of Surrey, UK_

In recent years, the institutionalisation of representative democracy vis-à-vis the role of the European Parliament in representing EU citizens’ interests has been contested. The Treaty of Lisbon has, therefore, increased the powers of the EP by extending, for instance, its legislative role. Yet, the augmentation of the EP’s functions has not fully addressed the question of democratic deficit in the EU. Hence, the ToL attempts to further the possibility of direct democracy via other means. Article 11 TEU encompasses a host of different platforms which give voice to the EU citizens. Similarly, Article 11(4)TEU and Regulation 211/2011 provide for the European Citizens’ Initiative (ECI). According to the relevant provisions, a million signatures supporting an ECI may lead to it becoming the basis of a legislative proposal. In light of the Lisbon emphasis on participatory democracy, this paper will examine the current place of democracy in the EU through institutional change and civic participation in the democratic life of the EU. Despite the fact that only a handful of ECIs have been registered, we will consider whether there are any lessons to be learned from current practice for improving participatory democracy and civil dialogue. The paper will finally discuss the limits of influence of the European Parliament and citizens and civil society in EU decision-making.
Awkward partners in regional integration

Panel convenor: Dr Hana Umezawa, UNU-CRIS, Belgium

Panel abstract:

The objective of this panel is to investigate the nature of ‘awkward partners’ in the regional integration. We suggest that awkwardness refers to an uncomfortable state of affairs in which one party strives to participate in a region but lacks full belonging and commitment to the goals of the latter or is perceived as not fully belonging by other players in the region. The panel is of significance in that it would ultimately contribute to the further development of both empirical and conceptual studies of comparative regional integration analysis of Europe and Asia, and possibly other regions, where cross-fertilisation and a shared research agenda have recently been generated. One of the issues that should be investigated in this regard is why so many regions contain states which are ‘awkward’ members. The panel includes papers analysing the UK, Japan, and Australia regarding their respective contexts of regionalism or regional integration. This may appear counter-intuitive in that there are vast differences between the three countries in terms of geography, economic linkages, identity, and the place and role of each in its separate regional processes. Moreover, there are significant difference between European integration and Asian regionalism in terms of institutions, norms and practices, yet each is characterised by trade cooperation and attempts to develop closer collaboration among states. The panel would attempt to generate hypotheses to guide future empirical work about awkward states in regional integration and regionalism. We do this by evaluating the three countries’ relationship with their respective regional organisations, focusing on the interaction of various material factors (i.e. power relations, institutional and policy preferences, economic objectives, security concerns and domestic politics) and ideational factors (i.e. regional identity and vision on the region) that are producing their awkwardness.

Awkward states and regional organisations: the case of Australia
Prof Philomena Murray, University of Melbourne, Australia

This article seeks to fill this gap by examining the regional ‘awkwardness’ of Australia in the Asia-Pacific region. Australia is can be regarded as an ‘awkward’ state in the region in its approaches to institutions, economic policy, security and identity. The article analyse the role of power, institutions, economy, domestic politics and culture to see which mix best accounts for the awkward status of Australia. The finding of this article sheds new light on the study of other states like Japan, the United States, China, France and even Mexico that show some form of regional awkwardness, providing an ideal basis for the comparison in this panel. This article demonstrates that the uniqueness of Australia’s position found in regionalism literature is in fact a nearly universal phenomenon, insofar as many global regions include awkward states.

Awkward states and regional organisations: the case of UK
Prof Alex Warleigh-Lack, CRonEM, University of Surrey, UK

The UK is generally considered the paradigm case of an ‘awkward partner’ in the European integration process. And yet, to date the UK has never rejected either an EU treaty or EU membership in a referendum. Similarly, it has a reputation as a reliable implementer of EU legislation, with a better track record in this regard than most other member states. The perception of British ‘awkwardness’ has also persisted despite the fact that, in day-to-day EU operations, the UK is often a dextrous player of diplomatic games. The paper explores the material and ideational factors that allowed this diagnosis to arise and persist. In sum, the UK’s awkwardness can be considered a mixture of material and ideational factors, and also as an on-going but malleable feature of the UK-EU relationship. Cause and effect in British awkwardness are difficult to disentangle, but perhaps lie above all in a sense of cultural, economic and political distinctiveness, and a sense that Britain does not really need European integration for anything other than trade.

Awkward’ and/or ‘unique’? Japan’s position in the region and the positive way forward
Dr Hana Umezawa, UNU-CRIS, Belgium

The overall objective of this paper is to analyse the ‘awkward’ nature of Japan in Asia-Pacific region through its approaches to institutions, economic policy, security and identity in the region. The paper argues that Japan’s ‘awkward’ status in the region has in fact positive aspect in the enhancement of regional integration of Asia and beyond. Despite its ‘awkwardness’ in the region, Japan has never been reluctant about being involved in the region. In fact, its awkwardness means Japan can make a unique contribution in the regional integration process in Asia. Its endeavour in this regard is reflected in its long-standing promotion of ‘open
regionalism’ which refers to the desired non-exclusive nature of regionalism and regional co-operation in the Asia-Pacific region. Japan has been promoting this concept through various dialogue frameworks in Asia and beyond, including APEC, ARF, and ASEM. In this paper, the motivations and methods through which Japan attempts to regulate contact with regional and international actors will be analysed. Concluding remarks will present the way for Japan to further utilise its ‘awkward’ position in the region in a positive manner in the enhancement of regional integration and cooperation in Asia and beyond.