

# ELIAMEP TIMES

January – February 2005



*This issue's contents:*

[Forthcoming Events](#)

[2005: A defining year for the EU](#)

[News on ELIAMEP's EU Research Projects](#)

[Featured Events](#)

[Other Research at ELIAMEP](#)

[ELIAMEP News](#)

ELIAMEP,

49, Vass. Sofias Avenue, 106 76 Athens, Greece

T +30 210 72 57 110; F +30 210 72 57 114

E [eliamep@eliamep.gr](mailto:eliamep@eliamep.gr); url [www.eliamep.gr](http://www.eliamep.gr)

**ELIAMEP TIMES**

Editor: Ruby Gropas [ruby@eliamep.gr](mailto:ruby@eliamep.gr)

**WARMEST WISHES FOR A PROSPEROUS,  
CREATIVE AND PEACEFUL 2005 FROM ALL  
THE ELIAMEP TEAM**

## 2005: A DEFINING YEAR FOR THE EU

Beyond a shadow of a doubt, the future of the EU Constitution will be the Big Issue for 2005. With referenda planned in Spain, France, Denmark, Ireland, Portugal and Poland, the campaigns for the 'yes' vote are already underway.

Greece will not be holding a referendum and it is expected that the EU Constitution will be ratified by the Greek Parliament. Nevertheless, ELIAMEP has been an ardent supporter of the need to inform the general public of the scope and aims of this Constitution and to engage the European citizens in the debate on the future choices and directions of Europe.

In light of this, a series of events on the **European Constitution and the Future of Europe** will be organized by ELIAMEP throughout Greece over the coming months. Academics and civil society representatives will be invited to join forces in order to make EU affairs more accessible to the Greek public, to make the future of Europe more relevant to the European voter, and to involve the public in a debate on the implications of the Constitution for Greece and for Europe. Additional details on the programme, including dates, will be available on our website, and overviews of each event will be included in the forthcoming issues of ELIAMEP Times.

The EU agenda is faced with a number of big issues for this year. Among these is the mid-term review of the Lisbon Agenda and agreement on the EU budget for 2007 –2013. In 2005, the Commission is also expected to present its five-year action plan for the adoption and implementation of the Hague programme that aims to make Europe an area of freedom, security, and justice. Its implications for immigration and border control will be at the forefront of the debates at the national and European levels. The reform of the UN, relations with the US, Russia and China, and developments in the Near East will equally top the foreign affairs agenda of the EU and its Member States, as will developments in the Balkans. These priorities will be reflected in ELIAMEP's seminars, conferences and policy papers.

## KEY FORTHCOMING EVENTS

### JANUARY

- 12 Public Debate on **"The European Constitution and the Future of Europe."** Key speakers: Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs Yannis Valinakis, MP Anna Diamantopoulou, MP Antonis Skylakos and Prof. Loukas Tsoukalis. The debate will be co-ordinated by Ms. Maria Houkli, journalist with NET.
- 13 **Comparative Politics Seminar Series.** Dia Anagnostou: *"Deepening democracy or protecting the nation? The Europeanisation of minority rights and Greek citizenship."*

### FEBRUARY

- 3 **Comparative Politics Seminar Series.** Susannah Verney: *"Explaining the EC's second enlargement: promoting interests, consolidating democracy or returning to its roots?"*
- 11-14 **POLITIS** Meeting at the University of Oldenburg, Germany with the support of the European Commission
- 18-21 Final Meeting of the **Greek-Turkish Civic Dialogue**, in Athens organized in collaboration with the Istanbul Policy Centre.
- 24-26 **EMEDIATE** Conference organized at EUI in Florence with the support of the European Commission

*For information on our lectures, meetings and conferences, consult our  
ACTIVITIES section on our website or contact, Ms. Loukia  
Anagnostopoulou, Activities Department:*

T: + 30 210 72 57 124 ; Email: [activities@eliamep.gr](mailto:activities@eliamep.gr)

## NEWS ON ELIAMEP's EU RESEARCH PROJECTS

### WIDER EUROPE, DEEPER INTEGRATION?

**EU - CONSENT, Wider Europe, deeper integration? "Constructing Europe" Network.** CONSENT is a Network of Excellence intended to be launched within 2005 and to be funded by the European Commission under the 6th Framework Programme, Priority 7, Research Area 4.

As a network of excellence for joint research and teaching, **EU-CONSENT** will look at the construction of a new Europe. It will address questions regarding the mutually reinforcing effects of deepening and widening by developing and working with three sets of expectations. These will be used to analyse the past experiences of the EU and to develop an innovative framework for the future integration beyond Western Europe.

#### EU-CONSENT – 3 sets of expectations

The 'Reinvented Union'  
The Future EU is New for Everyone



The 'Virtuous Spiral'  
Success Breeds  
Success

The 'Vicious Spiral'  
Overstrain Leads to  
Overstretch

Within this conceptual framework, 25 teams organized along functional and thematic lines, will test lessons from the past in view of their academic and political validity for discussing visions and scenarios for the future. The major *leitmotiv* is that the Union is in the midst of a full process of **reinventing itself** – a development which is, however, difficult to grasp and explain.

The common framework will include integrating activities (common conferences and workshops, activities in plenum and in teams), common research ('EU-25 Watch' and WEB-CONSENT), teaching activities (traditional and virtual courses - EDEIOS, virtual study units on EU deepening and widening, as well as a PhD Centre of Excellence and internships for young researchers) and dissemination activities (public events and common publications). The results of the integrating activities will flow into common databases such as the E-Library, a multilingual glossary on EU deepening and widening, bibliographies and core curricula, which will all be made available on the WEB-CONSENT. It will also offer yardsticks for observing the progress made by the whole project.

ELIAMEP is one of the 49 partner institutes that make up this Network of Excellence, co-ordinated by the University of Kohl, under the lead of Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Wessels and managed by Dipl. Reg. Wiss Jana Fleschenberg.

**ELIAMEP** will be responsible for co-ordinating the team that will be working on "*Economic integration: approaches, lessons and visions for the future.*" Our major task will be to bring together the economic dimensions from all work packages, and especially from Workpackage VI on Economic and Social Policies for the enlarged European Union, and to integrate these into the overall theoretical frame. The team will explore different methods through which political integration has been furthered through economic instruments in the past, and discuss the extent to which this may continue to be the model ahead in the enlarged/ing Europe. Particular emphasis will be attributed to linking economic policies and economic integration to political choices and to the overall shape and direction of European integration. The team's aim will be to look at the relationships between economic policies and basic political values and to raise questions about stability, growth, the redistributive dimension of the EU, and democracy in the enlarged European Union

Our preliminary website is:

<http://www.comos.org/EU-CONSENT/Index.htm>

For further information, please contact:

Prof. Loukas Tsoukalis ([lbs@eliamep.gr](mailto:lbs@eliamep.gr))

Dr. Ruby Gropas ([ruby@eliamep.gr](mailto:ruby@eliamep.gr))



**Integrating the Balkans in the European Union: Functional Borders and Sustainable Security**

On the 18<sup>th</sup> of November 2004, the **Final Conference** of the IBEU research project was held in Brussels and organized in collaboration with DG RTD of the EU Commission. The main objective of this conference was to present the key results of our collaborative two-year research on the changing nature of borders and security in the context of EU-SEE relations. We equally sought to discuss the relevant policy implications with policy-makers in Brussels, experts from this region and academics.

The conference was opened by Dr. **Achilleas Mitsos**, Director General of DG Research. Dr. Mitsos stressed the dual value of research, in terms of contributing new knowledge and understanding to the social sciences, while also contributing to the definition of EU policies in specific priority areas.

Some of the key policy recommendations that have been put forward by the researchers that collaborated within the IBEU project are summarized below. All **Policy Briefs** and **key papers** that have been

prepared within IBEU can be downloaded from the Research project section of ELIAMEP's website. The full synthesis of this project's findings is currently being finalized by the co-ordinators and will be published in an **ELIAMEP Policy Paper** in the early months of 2005.

***WHAT KEY CHARACTERISTICS ACROSS SEE ARE PERTINENT TO THE BALKAN COUNTRIES' DEVELOPMENT AND TO THE PROSPECTS FOR REGIONAL CO-OPERATION?***

IBEU's empirical research on the informal sector and regional co-operation and our sociological surveys on social capital and migration flows have explored the influence of borders. In particular, the role of formal and informal in shaping socio-economic developments in the Balkans was at the core of our work. The Balkans are marked by high unemployment rates, significant macroeconomic imbalances, pervasive informality and corruption, particularistic social capital and emigration. Recourse to informal practice or informal exchange is a widespread phenomenon in SEE. Networks of economic and political agents, rather than markets, are the dominant mechanisms through which economic exchange is conducted. These networks operate as parallel, private systems of authority, advancing particularistic interests. They create invisible borders of participation, which often run along the lines of kinship, ethnicity or political affiliation, cutting across SEE societies and breeding insecurity.

The scale and nature of involvement of state agents in these networks, where corruption, collusion and influence are instrumental, has made non-compliant behaviour into the norm at all levels of society. And, in turn, has undermined the social legitimacy of rules, thereby spreading informality and weakening social consensus against it. For businesses, the "informality trap" becomes a matter of opportunity as much as of necessity to remain competitive. Thus, the informal economy in SEE is approximately twice the size of most transition countries and with no signs of substantial decline over the years.

It is urgent to strengthen civil society and to pursue regional co-operation, in spite of current obstacles mainly related to 'hard' borders. It is equally necessary to discourage recourse to informality. These are important not necessarily for their economic value, but mainly for the political implications. In this, the role of the EU as a regional anchor and a promoter of regional co-operation is indispensable; principally because SEE has a 'hub-and-spoke' relationship with the EU across all sectors (SEE is much better connected with the EU than with itself). Bringing down borders, both official and invisible, through cross-border co-operation on infrastructure or trade related issues just as much as internally through increasing social capital and limiting the influence of

informal networks/agents on the economy, society and governance of the countries across SEE, is a priority. This has a very significant soft-security aspect that would contribute significantly to increasing legitimacy for the democratic political regimes that are being consolidated, for sustainable economic growth and regional stability, and for closer integration with the EU.

***SOME POLICY-RELEVANT CONCLUSIONS:***

- The empowerment of local governments is likely to increase the levels of social trust and civic participation. If national governments in the region are more decisive in transferring real resources and decision-making powers to the local levels, higher levels of social capital may be achieved (in addition to other potentially beneficial consequences associated with decentralisation).
- Improved institutional performance may increase social capital in the region. However, this is a very slow, gradual process that may not necessarily be easily identifiable. In effect, people in the countries surveyed do not actively base their perceptions and evaluations on personal experience. Rather, they tend to follow existing, predominantly negative, stereotypes about the workings of public institutions.
- Income-related and educational policies are insufficient to increase social capital in Southeastern Europe. Explicit policies designed to address particularism are necessary to support the Balkan's 'Europeanisation' process. For instance, strong external pressure for increased political pluralism must continue to be a priority; the more competitive a system is, the more predatory elites are restrained in 'capturing' and disproportionately benefiting from state resources.
- The SAP is essentially built around a top-down approach prioritising governance efficiency, the adoption of governance standards and institutional capacity building. For state agents and public institutions to fulfill their responsibilities in an efficient manner and independently from the pressures of privileged networks and groups, they require public support. (Or, at the very least, they require wide-spread compliance with regulations and formal procedures – this is necessarily underpinned by a generalised trust in state agents and institutions able to perform their functions on the basis of fair and equitable treatment). In these tired post-communist and post-conflict societies, where trust and patience is waning, it is important to complement the SAP with initiatives that will trigger popular consensus in support of the necessary reforms and adjustments.

- CARDS, in part, addresses these issues through its focus on strengthening citizen participation, civil society at the local level, and the municipal level of government. Its limited resources have by default limited the scope and the results of its work. For the 'implementation' challenge to be met, it is not sufficient to expect that improved institutional performance will automatically generate increased trust and universalistic social capital. Thus, it is important to complement the emphasis that EU policies attribute to technocratic improvement and efficiency with social capital-building policies and with 'perception-enhancing' policies.
- Legislative reform should take into consideration the ability of national administrations to enforce new regulations, and of businesses to comply with these. A system able to assess the impact of new regulations would be useful.
- For these markets to economically and institutionally grow closer to the EU, recourse to informality has to be made less of an incentive. This is the case for both local and international firms.
- Extending EU competition policy and anti-monopoly measures to the region should be pursued, particularly as the state and private monopolies (especially foreign firms or banks) that are commonplace in the Balkans, have slowed down the integration process and have exacerbated the misallocation and even misappropriation of resources.
- Co-operation in fiscal policies could also be encouraged for the following reasons: to simplify and render more transparent the fiscal systems across the region; to decrease the influence of local business lobbies and networks on tax policy with a view to retaining monopoly positions in the area/ country; to reduce taxes where possible so as to lower the cost of doing business and eliminate exemptions and preferences.
- Encouraging co-operation with regard to exchange rate policies across the region, for instance through an indirect exchange rate co-ordination using the euro as an anchor, would be similarly useful. This is especially warranted given that exchange rate misalignments and shocks due to risks of devaluation further hold back intra-regional trade.
- Given the choice between a multilateral free trade area and a customs union with the EU, the latter would be preferred since it is more in line with the prospect of EU integration. Regrettably, this is not a feasible option at the moment. First, the differences between the various Balkan countries on their EU path are too diverse (in terms of status of relations, etc). Second, because each individual country naturally give a higher priority to furthering bilateral negotiations with the EU than with the other countries of the region. Thus, the multilateralisation of the bilateral free trade agreements seems to be the most that can be achieved at present.
- SEE is also a transit region with unexploited opportunities for trade and investment. The liberalisation of the services sector across the whole region has to be up-scaled. It is equally necessary to convince all sides that cross-border infrastructure and investment projects are beneficial to all involved. The role of the EU in inducing local public actors to co-operate is of course pivotal.
- The EU learning and socialization process is the most suited to sharing information, experiences and expertise. Although the EU is now facing the huge challenge of 'digesting' its recent enlargement, the new Member States have significant expertise to pass on and cannot become introvert. The countries of Central and Eastern Europe have faced similar post-communist (though naturally not post-conflict) trials and have recently gone through the accession experience. They have experienced the challenges of transition, of meeting the so-called EU standards, of implementing the *acquis*, of liberalising their markets, of modernising their administrations, etc. It is important that this experience be shared. Just as important is the experience that older Member States (and especially Greece) can impart particularly in addressing economic underdevelopment of certain regions, and absorbing cohesion and structural funds.
- On the EU side, EU efforts must focus on increasing the visibility of the positive aspects of immigration, particularly in the new host countries. Campaigns promoting immigration-friendly attitudes must factor into their objectives measures aimed at easing the fears of potential 'losers.'
- In addition, with regard to the immigration dimension, EU policies have to focus on more and better-targeted social inclusion initiatives. Here, immigrant associations and other networks of civic character may be useful interlocutors. Just as important is the need to pursue the modernisation of the public administration services of its own Member States. In order to minimise the proportion of immigrants that fall into illegality or irregular status in the host society (with consequences for the labour market, their socio-economic security, informality, etc), the regularisation processes have to be made more transparent, more efficient, and in many cases less discriminatory in their application.
- The EU ought to speed up and strengthen the accession process of the Balkans so as to provide the necessary push to transforming the domestic

political agendas. Rendering candidate status tangible makes the prospect of eventual membership more realistic, more constraining and more of a catalyst for the much needed reform and co-operation throughout the region. Left to itself, there is a concern that the region risks reverting to 'Balkanisation.'

- Lastly, given that the Balkans are not a foreign policy issue for the EU, moving the Western Balkans from DG RELEX to DG ENLARGEMENT is a very welcome move. The co-ordinated efforts of all the DGs and services of the Commission on addressing the socio-economic challenges the Balkans face must be further supported. It is through this concerted effort that the EU's soft-power capabilities can be best put to use in nurturing a security community of integrated economies and stable democracies.

*Scientific Project co-ordinators:*

Prof. Loukas Tsoukalis ([lbs@eliamep.gr](mailto:lbs@eliamep.gr))

Dr. Ruby Gropas ([ruby@eliamep.gr](mailto:rubby@eliamep.gr))

*IBEU is funded by the 3rd Call of the Key-Action: "Improving the Socio-Economic Knowledge Base" of the European Commission, DG Research under Theme 3: Citizenship, governance, and the dynamics of European integration and enlargement. IBEU (2002-2005) was co-ordinated by ELIAMEP (Athens) and involved the LSE (London), IECOB (Forli), WIIW (Vienna), CLS (Sofia), IME (Sofia) and SAR (Bucharest).*

*Project website: [www.eliamep.gr](http://www.eliamep.gr)*

## FEATURED EVENTS

### ELIAMEP 2004 ANNUAL LECTURE: 'LOOKING AHEAD...' BY MR. THEODORE PAPALEXOPOULOS

The 2004 ELIAMEP Annual Lecture honoured Mr. Theodore Papalexopoulos, Industrialist.

Professor Loukas Tsoukalis welcomed and introduced Mr. Papalexopoulos to the large audience that had gathered in the Main Assembly Hall of the Old Parliament. His successes in the business sector were highlighted, as well as his active contribution in supporting and developing Greek civil society.



*Mr. Theodore  
Papalexopoulos,  
Industrialist*

Mr. Papalexopoulos took the floor underlining that the twenty-first century brought a new era of disintegration with most countries facing issues they are unable to handle alone. At present, the most pressing challenges include immigration and

unemployment. Both are bound to continue their ascending trend, with far-reaching implications for host countries' political and social environment, for their security and social health.

Notwithstanding its shortcomings, democracy is still expected to survive the multitude of challenges it is currently up against, not least because 'there is simply nothing better.' Nonetheless, Mr. Papalexopoulos stressed that it is a political system with three methodological weaknesses. With regard to the international community, it reacts too slowly at a time when quick responses are required. With regard to Europe, at a time when an able and intuitive European leadership is needed, leaders are elected at local and national levels, thereby not nurturing conditions for the longer-term political development of the European Union's democracy. Lastly, when it comes to Greece, the official tenure of each government discourages politicians from focusing on long-term problems. This has contributed to a perpetually defective system with no, or in any case limited, active civic participation.

Mr. Papalexopoulos proposed a series of actions that may contribute to addressing some of these problems. Private initiatives taken by NGOs must be encouraged, and these ought to be supported by the business sector. Where there exists the necessary will to co-operate, mutual interests are easily attained. The difficulty of bringing together diverse institutions could be overcome with the creation of a website that would serve as a meeting point and that would flourish within a year. He argued in favour of lowering our expectations for financial assistance on behalf of governmental institutions. It is the business world that should take the initiative to nurture and facilitate the development of an active civil society and the modernization of our public administration. On this point, Mr. Papalexopoulos noted that we are indeed unaccustomed to receiving help from the private sector without becoming suspicious of ulterior motives, but in order to move forward and creatively address the social challenges our democracies are up against, politicians should not be negatively predisposed towards such initiatives. A social partnership with the private sector ought to flourish in new sectors.

Mr. Papalexopoulos concluded that we are experiencing a fascinating era of interdependency wherein democratic institutions are finding difficulty in coping with current challenges and their future prospects. The only possible solution can be found in the transparent participation of active civilians in the public dialogue. Ultimately, new technologies offer a unique opportunity for bringing ideas and people closer. It will no doubt be hard, but it is not impossible: 'breeding ideas, breeds solutions.' To



quote Mahatma Gandhi: 'Be the change you want to see in the world'.



*Group picture with Mr. Papalexopoulos and the ELIAMEP team after the Annual Lecture*

Mr. Alexis Papahelas, Journalist and Member of ELIAMEP's Board of Directors presented a video tribute to Mr. Papalexopoulos and his work. This short documentary included comments from prominent personalities from the business world and from the political and cultural community. Professor Theodore Couloumbis on behalf of ELIAMEP presented a commemorative plaque to Mr. Papalexopoulos for his contribution to Greek public life.

**LECTURE BY MR. BILL EMMOTT, EDITOR IN CHIEF OF THE ECONOMIST, ON *"The US, the EU and the Middle East: Where next?"***

Last November, Mr. Emmott was invited by ELIAMEP to discuss the challenges facing the transatlantic partnership and the state of world affairs. Mr. Emmott tackled the new elements that are present in current US foreign policy and discussed his perspectives on what aspects actually constitute a continuation with the main characteristics of the post-1945 structure and style of US foreign policy. In particular, he drew parallels between the Bush Administration's approach to international relations and the US containment policy toward the USSR, the unilateral attempt to impose regime change in Cuba, and the pursuit of the war in Vietnam outside the UN structures. These examples illustrate that multilateralism has only been applied by US administrations when it has served to fortify and further US interests.

At the same time, Mr. Emmott underlined that the principal difference lies with the impatient character of this Administration toward world affairs. This impatience is complicated by the fact that there exist multiple foreign policy objectives that cannot be pursued in tandem (since the longer-term objectives cannot be addressed with short-term uses of hard power). The main US objectives were identified as: the democratic transformation of the Middle East; the elimination of the perceived threat of WMD; opportunism in terms of seizing the political

opportunity to change Iraq's regime; the importance of control over oil and its perceived importance for the world economy; the display of US power as a deterrent to potentially opposing forces; and, clearing the scene across the Middle East and Central Asia from terrorism. With regard to what to expect from George W. Bush's second term, Bill Emmott expressed the belief that further hard-power and aggression would be used within Iraq to consolidate the democratic regime that the US is determined to put into place. In his opinion, US hard power will most probably be limited to Iraq and not directed to other cases in the region.

He then went on to discuss the evolution of the Middle East and the extent to which future developments will be driven by the region itself as well as by US foreign policy. The January 2005 elections in Iraq and in the Palestinian Authority were considered as key factors for the region as a whole, and for the sensitive balances and tugs-of-war between those in favour of political resolution and those prepared to resort to violence. Outsiders – and especially the US – have an important role to help balance these divides and in all cases, outside actors must encourage the route of political resolution.



*Professor Loukas Tsoukalis and Mr. Bill Emmott*

The viability of Saudi Arabia was identified as another determining actor for developments in the Middle East. Population pressures, terrorist threats, the risk of a civil war in neighbouring Iraq and the evolution of the price of oil over the next decade will determine the extent of the sustainability of the system of this Sunni fundamentalist monarchy, with wide-reaching implications for the region. And, Iran's sense of long-term vulnerability in the region (due to US troops in Iraq, Israel) was underlined in terms of explaining its nuclear ambitions. The acquisition of nuclear power may lead to the further entrenchment of the hard-line conservatives. Mr. Emmott concluded that he did not expect a show of force vis à vis Iran on behalf of the US in the short term due to the difficulties that have been faced in Iraq. In this case, it is more likely that the US will pursue a policy of containment and delay to buy time until the political and strategic situation in the region enables more direct action towards Iran.

With regard to EU-US relations, Emmott argued that though this rift has been deep, basic interests and values are still strongly shared. The main issue that has

caused this rift has been about process on behalf of the US administration and about the lack of success in Iraq, and, although the cultural divide between the two sides of the pond may be growing, there is no political divide. Nonetheless, the most important casualty of this divide has been the impact on NATO. At the top of the list for reconciliation between the Transatlantic partners, came the need to achieve compromises on trade issues (within the WTO), convergence on the long-term objective of democratic transformation of the Middle East (which will have to be revamped into a more legitimate format – similar to the Helsinki process during the Cold War), the potential for co-operation in 2005-6 in Israel and Palestine, and the future handling of Iran. At the same time, the EU will have to conclude the debate on whether it defines itself as a counter-weight to the US and focus more on working as an effective operator in world affairs in co-operation with the US.

Finally, the issue of whether global economic growth can continue to be reconciled with political instability was raised. It was noted that the global economy has been registering substantial positive economic growth – particularly on behalf of the developing economies such as China, India, Brazil – in spite of the crises and tensions in international affairs. The question is whether politics has the potential to change the course of the economy (as it has in the past – for instance with the 2 World Wars or the oil crisis in the 1970s). The worse-case scenarios include nuclear terrorism, the spread of conflict across the Middle East not just as civil wars but also inter-state conflict, and the eventual ‘capture’ of a state such as Saudi Arabia or Pakistan by Al-Qaeda; none are impossible yet none are likely outcomes either.

The prevailing trend is one of global openness to investment, people, ideas, the spread of liberal economic systems, democracy and regional trade; and, the EU and the US are responsible for continuing to work in this direction. In the long-term, this openness and the growth of the developing economies (China, India and Brazil in particular) will change the current balance of power in the world. In this environment, multilateral solutions and structures are likely to be more feasible.

---

## **OTHER RESEARCH at ELIAMEP with the support of the ALEXANDER ONASSIS PUBLIC BENEFIT FOUNDATION**

### **THE EVOLVING SECURITY ENVIRONMENT IN THE EASTERN MEDITERRANEAN**

Dr. Ian O. Lesser has joined us as **Onassis Fellow** with the Hellenic Foundation for European and

Foreign Policy (December 2004 – June 2005). He is President of Mediterranean Advisors in Washington, DC, an adjunct staff member at RAND, and a Senior Fellow of the Western Policy Center. From 2001-2004 he was Vice President and Director of Studies at the Pacific Council on International Policy in Los Angeles (the western partner of the Council on Foreign Relations). Ian Lesser is also a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the International Institute for Strategic Studies, the Advisory Board of the International Spectator (Rome), and a councillor of the Atlantic Council of the U.S.

Over the coming months, Dr. Lesser will be engaged in research and analysis on the evolving security environment in the eastern Mediterranean, with particular attention to the role of the United States, as well as the implications for transatlantic relations and for Greece. The analysis will take into account the prospective opening of EU accession negotiations with Turkey, continuing instability in Iraq, the looming issue of Iran’s nuclear program, and the consequences of alternative Palestinian-Israeli scenarios. The project will reflect discussions in Greece and around the region, and will result in an **ELIAMEP Policy Paper**.

### **LECTURE BY AHMET EVIN, ONASSIS FELLOW WITH ELIAMEP, FOLLOWING THE EU DECISION ON TURKEY’S ACCESSION NEGOTIATIONS**

Professor Ahmet Evin gave a lecture at ELIAMEP on the 20<sup>th</sup> of December 2004, immediately following the EU Council decision. He analyzed the relationship between the EU and Turkey, offering a positive insight on their expected development, which he believes will be smooth and fruitful. By making Turkey an EU member, the Union creates a stable bridge that connects Europe to the geo- strategic but also unstable region of the Middle East. He referred to the historical links between some of the current EU Member States and the Ottoman Empire, and noted that Turkey’s long history of secularization differentiates this country from other Arab states.

Professor Evin also referred to the thorny issues in EU-Turkey relations, the main one being Cyprus. He argued, however, that these thorns could be successfully ‘trimmed.’ With regard to the Cyprus question it was stressed that a solution will be reached by October 3rd 2005. With regard to Greek-Turkish relations, he made a case for these two Balkan powers to play a more active leadership role in the region; and, in the same way that France and Germany have done in the past, work increasingly closer together to promote European integration in southeastern Europe.

## ELIAMEP News

### 2004 ANNUAL MARSHALL MEMORIAL FELLOWSHIP VISIT

ELIAMEP has been traditionally and persistently committed to promoting EU-US co-operation, and, one of the most effective ways of strengthening the strong ties between the two sides of the Atlantic is through our human capital.

In 2000, ELIAMEP accepted the invitation to co-ordinate the German Marshall Fund's Marshall Memorial Fellowship Programme for Greece. The Marshall Programme's aim is to create a network of young European leaders who possess first hand knowledge and understanding of American institutions and society. Since 2001, ELIAMEP is also co-ordinating the American component of the Marshall Memorial Fellowship. This was launched by the GMF in 1999 to educate a new generation of American leaders about Europe, the transatlantic partnership and global challenges that both sides face.

We asked Tim Wirth who was one of this year's Marshall Fellows to write a few words with his impressions of this trip. Tim Wirth is Director of the San Francisco Bay Program, The Trust for Public Land:

*"This past October, I spent a month in Europe with fifteen other Americans on a Memorial Marshall Fellowship. The purpose of the fellowship, which is sponsored by the German Marshall Fund of the United States, is to stimulate an exchange of ideas and promote transatlantic co-operation. Needless to say, given the present state of U.S./European relations, we had our work cut out for us. My travel itinerary included five days each in Brussels, Lille, Athens, Bratislava and Berlin. Each city offered a window of insight into a different part of Europe. After a month of meetings, I would not pretend to now be an expert on Europe, but I came away from the experience with a much deeper appreciation for the complexity, diversity and richness of the continent and also for the critical importance of mending the transatlantic relationship. One of our speakers compared U.S./European relations to a fifty-year old marriage; the passion has perhaps waned, but there are too many connections and shared experiences to consider a divorce. Like every relationship, ours needs to be nurtured and must adapt to changing times and conditions. My hope is that the transatlantic partnership will not only survive the next fifty years, but it will flourish, and together with vision, resolve, respect and humility, we can make the world a better place.*

*Note: My visit to Athens was one of the highlights of the trip. Many thanks to ELIAMEP and the staff for being such generous hosts!"*

### CALL FOR STUDENT RESEARCHERS EXTENTION OF DEADLINE!

**2<sup>nd</sup> Call for international students in Austria, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, the Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Sweden**  
***Application deadline: January 23<sup>rd</sup> 2005***

POLITIS-Europe is an EU-funded research project. The project seeks to improve our understanding of different factors that promote or inhibit active civic participation of immigrants and explores third country immigrants' views on Europe. A unique project construction is developed that includes the involvement of international students.

Project site: [www.uni-oldenburg.de/politis-europe](http://www.uni-oldenburg.de/politis-europe)

#### *Eligibility criteria*

- You are a student (bachelor, master, PhD-student or having recently submitted PhD dissertation) in one of the EU states named above.
- We expect students to conduct interviews between September 05 and January 06 in their EU state of study. So there should be a high probability that you are there during this time.
- You are not born in the EU state in question; or you are born in this EU state, but you have lived outside the EU; or you have been involved with research on immigrants in the EU state concerned.
- You have a strong interest in political and societal developments and a good knowledge of English.

To apply, please send your complete application in **one file**, containing:

- a motivation letter (two good reasons why we should select you, explanations concerning your suitability for the project)
- a short CV, starting with information on your gender; date and country of birth; country of citizenship; year and country of last school certificate; begin, place, discipline, and planned date of end of current studies; year of migration to your current residence country.
- a short essay (800 to 1200 words) on the question: ***What does Europe mean to you personally?*** We are just interested in collecting personal opinions of students from all over the world. Equally, we are looking for candidates who are able to communicate their ideas in English. So don't be afraid to write down your thoughts, you are not selected on the scientific quality of your essay.

**Send your application by e-mail to:**

[politis-europe@uni-oldenburg.de](mailto:politis-europe@uni-oldenburg.de)

**We will only accept e-mailed applications! Important: Write 'Politis' as first word in the subject line in this and all further e-mail communications**