Introduction

ARENA Centre for European Studies is an internationally recognised research centre at the Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Oslo. The centre conducts theoretically oriented and empirically informed basic research on the dynamics of the evolving European political order. Our research is organised along four key dimensions of European political order: the democratic dimension; the EU’s executive dimension; the knowledge dimension and the external dimension.

2016 was an eventful year for ARENA and the world. The Brexit referendum proved that the need for thorough research on the European order is as pressing as ever.

In June, the extensive Horizon 2020-funded research project GLOBUS was launched in Oslo with a large kick-off conference. The project, led by ARENA’s Helene Sjursen, will critically examine the European Union’s contribution to global justice. In Oslo, we gathered more than a hundred researchers from all over the world for two days of exciting discussions.

ARENA was awarded yet another highly competitive Horizon 2020 grant in 2016. The so-called Innovative Training Network PLATO will recruit 15 PhD candidates at nine universities across Europe. The overarching subject is the EU’s legitimacy after the financial crisis. The network led by Chris Lord is the third of its kind to be coordinated by the University of Oslo – and the first within the social sciences at UiO.

Furthermore, Cathrine Holst and Johan Christensen’s EUREX project started up in 2016 and recruited a PhD and a post-doctoral researcher to begin in 2017. We also launched the REFLEX project this year. Overall, ARENA bustles with life – 2016 saw the highest level of activity in years.

Oslo, May 2017
Prof. Erik O. Eriksen
ARENA Director
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Research projects
Integration and division
Towards a segmented Europe?

The aim of the EuroDiv project is to provide more knowledge on the implications of the current crisis and on possible ways out of the crisis.

About
What are the implications of the current European crisis for democracy and integration in a long-term perspective? What does it mean that countries both within and without the EU are integrated to different degrees? The assumption of the project Integration and division: Towards a segmented Europe? (EuroDiv) is that Europe is moving towards a permanent situation characterised by a more diversified EU.

Objectives
EuroDiv aims to establish how the crisis is transforming Europe and the implications this has for Norway as a closely associated non-member of the EU. Greater differentiation may give rise to particular patterns of segmentation with profound democratic and constitutional implications. EuroDiv seeks to establish how prevalent such segmentation trends are and whether there are important – democratic – countervailing forces.

A major objective is therefore to identify what the democratic and constitutional implications are of current patterns of transformation, what they entail for the sustainability of the European political order, and Norway’s role in relation to it.

Sub-projects
EuroDiv consists of four sub-projects, studying various aspects of differentiation in Europe. Law and democracy investigates the characteristics, scope and implications of the Eurozone crisis and its democratic and constitutional implications. The European executive order analyses the impact of the crisis on administrative systems at the EU and national levels. Economic development as segmentation studies important changes in the design of the monetary union and if these developments contribute to further segmentation. The fourth sub-project studies differentiated integration in the domain of foreign, security and defence policy.

Activities in 2016
A number of research seminars were staged in 2016, and EuroDiv researchers have presented their research at conferences, workshops and other events, and in a range of different media.

The EuroDiv sub-project on economic development as segmentation recruited a postdoctoral researcher from 2016. EuroDiv researchers furthermore contributed to – and co-edited – a special issue in Norsk Statsvitenskapelig Tidsskrift on the European Union’s foreign and security policy (see
p. 20). This publication contributes to a better understanding of the development of the EU’s foreign and security policies in light of internal and external crises in recent years. A special issue of the *Journal of Common Market Studies* was also published online in 2016. This deals with the EU’s response to the Ukraine crisis (see p. 21).

EuroDiv’s framework of differentiated integration has become increasingly relevant after Brexit. EuroDiv researchers have been active in the Norwegian and international Brexit debate. The project’s research on the EU’s non-members has proved particularly useful for analysing the possible options and consequences for the UK after leaving the EU.

**Funding**
The Research Council of Norway’s research initiative ‘Europe in Transition’ (EUROPA).

**Project period**
1 December 2013–30 November 2018

**Project coordinator**
Erik O. Eriksen

**ARENA project members**
Morten Egeberg, John Erik Fossum, Christopher Lord, Helene Sjurseth and Jarle Trondal (sub-project coordinators); Cathrine Holst, Jørgen Bølstad, Mai’a K. Davis Cross, Åse Gornitzka, Agustín José Menéndez, Asimina Michailidou, Espen D. H. Olsen and Hans-Jörg Trenz

**Cooperation**
Tom Christensen, *University of Oslo*
Hans Otto Frøland, *NTNU*
Per Lægreid, *University of Bergen*
David Mayes, *University of Auckland*
Hilmar Rommetvedt, *IRIS, Stavanger*
Bent Sofus Tranøy, *Hedmark University College*

**More:** [arena.uio.no/eurodiv](http://arena.uio.no/eurodiv)
Reconsidering European contributions to global justice – GLOBUS

Since its inception, the EU has proclaimed an ambition to promote justice at the global level. But what precisely is the EU’s contribution to global justice? And what could a just foreign policy look like?

About
GLOBUS is a research project that critically examines the European Union’s contribution to global justice. Challenges to global justice are multifaceted and what is just is contested. Combining normative and empirical research, GLOBUS explores underlying political and structural obstacles to justice. Analyses of the EU’s positions and policies are combined with in-depth studies of non-European perspectives on the practices of the EU.

Objectives
GLOBUS scholars combine analyses of the EU’s positions and policies on key aspects of global justice, with in-depth studies of third parties’ (state and non-state actors) perspectives on the practice of the EU. There is a particular focus on emerging powers – the BRICS states. Core sectors to be analysed are climate change, development and trade, security, and migration. Gender is addressed as a cross-cutting issue within all sectors.

Researchers engage with the nascent theoretical debates on how we should think about justice beyond the jurisdiction of the state. They contribute to these debates by proposing a novel conceptual and evaluative scheme delineating three different conceptions of global political justice: Justice as non-dominance, as impartiality and as mutual recognition.

Activities in 2016
GLOBUS was launched with a conference of over 100 participants in Oslo on 9 and 10 June 2016. The event brought together scholars from many different parts of the world to discuss the principled and practical dilemmas involved in developing a foreign policy to improve conditions for global justice. Professor Nancy Fraser, New School for Social Research and a member of the GLOBUS Scientific Advisory Board, held the keynote lecture (see p. 32).

The GLOBUS Research Paper series was launched with a first paper by Erik O. Eriksen. The Global Justice Blog has published several academic commentaries on current events (see p. 57).

ARENA’s GLOBUS team has given talks and presentations at several conferences and seminars, and data collection and analysis are well underway. The team at ARENA and the other GLOBUS partners have also prepared for a range of project events in 2017.

Funding
Research and Innovation Action financed by the European Union’s Horizon 2020 programme. Societal
Challenges 6: Europe in a changing world – Inclusive, innovative and reflective societies

**Project period**
1 June 2016–31 May 2020

**Project coordinator**
Helene Sjursen

**ARENA project members**
Mai’a K. Davis Cross, Erik Oddvar Eriksen, John Erik Fossum, Cathrine Holst, Christopher Lord, Agustín José Menéndez, Asimina Michailidou, Kjartan Koch Mikalsen, Espen D. H. Olsen and Johanne Døhlie Saltnes

**Cooperation**
*University of Tübingen*, Institute of Political Science, Thomaz Diez

*University College Dublin*, School of Politics and International Relations (SPIRe), Ben Tonra

*University of Bologna*, Department of Political and Social Sciences, Sonia Lucarelli

*University of the Witwatersrand*, Wits School of Governance, Pundy Pillay

*State University of Rio de Janeiro*, Institute of Social and Political Studies, Leticia Pinheiro

*O.P. Jindal Global University*, Jindal School of International Affairs, Rohee Dasgupta

*Renmin University of China*, Centre for European Studies, Xinning Song

More: [globus.uio.no](http://globus.uio.no)
Democracy and expert rule
The quest for reflexive legitimacy

How can depoliticised decision-making be legitimate? REFLEX examines the tension between knowledge and democracy in the European context of decision-making.

About
Modern democracies increasingly rely on expertise and independent expert bodies in political decision processes. Central banks, international organisations and courts, and not least EU agencies, are typical examples. The EU has set up more than 40 agencies to perform specific tasks under EU law, in areas such as food safety, aviation security and defence cooperation. Norway participates in 27 of these agencies, mainly through the EEA Agreement.

Many of these bodies make decisions with consequences for citizens’ well-being and freedom and operate within large zones of discretion. There is thus a risk of policy formation being based on experts’ judgements rather than on citizens’ opinion. The delegation of authority to expert bodies raises some fundamental questions for democracy, and how such bodies can be legitimate.

Objectives
REFLEX aims to establish what kind of democratic problem we are witnessing. That requires paying attention to the role and status of depoliticised bodies in democratic theory. Can they be justified in democratic terms?

REFLEX studies a selection of depoliticised bodies in the EU multilevel legislative chain within fields such as financial regulation, medicine, border protection, law enforcement and defence procurement. It compares depoliticised bodies under different formal arrangements – intergovernmental and supranational – in order to establish whether better ways of organising the relationship between expertise and politics exist.

By analysing the institutional and public linkages of several depoliticised bodies, REFLEX will be able to examine actual differences in the influence of expertise and their democratic check. These studies provide a broad empirical basis from which to establish a normative model of depoliticised bodies – an institutional design that meets democratic criteria. At the same time, they will lead to new empirical knowledge of whether or not the power of expertise is wielded legitimately.

Activities in 2016
REFLEX was launched in July 2016 and has started the process of recruiting new researchers to the project. Two positions have been announced so far, and the group has been expanded with a visiting researcher who has so far contributed with project development and preparing a future workshop. As part of the Toppforsk-scheme, one of REFLEX’ primary aims is to establish close links to other projects and to enable the project group to apply for additional
research funding. This work has been started in the first months of the project. The research group has also started preparing a kick-off workshop to be held in 2017.

**Funding**

REFLEX is jointly funded by the Research Council of Norway's FRIPRO Toppforsk (top research) scheme and the University of Oslo. Toppforsk funding is a targeted initiative for providing substantial, long-term funding to research groups with a potential to become international leaders in their field.

**Project period**

1 July 2016–30 June 2021

**Project coordinator**

Erik O. Eriksen

**ARENA project members**

Eva Krick, Christopher Lord, Asimina Michailidou, Kjartan Koch Mikalsen, Jarle Trondal

**Cooperation**

James Bohman, *Saint Louis University*  
Claudio Radaelli, *University of Exeter*  
Deirdre Curtin, *University of Amsterdam*  
Rainer Forst, *Goethe-University Frankfurt/Main*  
Christian Joerges, *University of Bremen*  
Richard Bellamy, *University College London*  
Charles Sabel, *Columbia University*  
Rainer Schmalz-Bruns, *University of Hannover*

**More: arena.uio.no/reflex**

*How can expert bodies such as the European Banking Authority (EBA) be legitimate? (Photo: EBA)*
Expertisation of public inquiry commissions in a Europeanised administrative order

EUREX looks into the role of scientific expertise in the preparation of public policies. What are the consequences for democracy of increased expertisation and Europeanisation?

About

Public inquiry commissions are a core element of policy-making in the Nordic countries. Previous research suggests that these commissions function both as an extension of public administration, as a way of including interest groups in policy formulation, and as a channel for incorporating expert advice in decision-making.

However, ongoing changes in conditions for governance are challenging the traditional role of inquiry commissions. Both expertisation, the increasing reliance on experts in politics and public administration, and Europeanisation, the processes by which national governance systems adapt to European-wide norms and EU-level bodies, have put existing policy advice mechanisms under pressure. These processes raise fundamental questions about the continued functioning and legitimacy of inquiry commissions: Is the investigation of policy problems and solutions increasingly left to a small elite of national and international experts? Are processes of expertisation and Europeanisation eroding the democratic and governance credentials of inquiry commissions?

Objectives

EUREX will provide a study centred on the Norwegian system of public inquiry commissions, known as NOUs (Norges offentlige utredninger) where two main research questions will be examined:

1. How has the NOU system changed in response to processes of expertisation and Europeanisation?

2. What are the consequences of these changes for democracy and good governance?

These questions will be addressed within a multi-dimensional, multi-method research design that incorporates historical, comparative, European and normative dimensions. The project will analyse the transformation of the NOU system over time in light of expertisation and Europeanisation, across policy areas, in contrast to simultaneous changes in other countries, and from the perspective of competing normative goals.

Activities in 2016

EUREX was launched in 2016 with the first meeting in the project’s User Forum. This forum consists of members with experience from different parts of the Norwegian public enquiry system. Leaders of inquiry commissions and key persons in public administration, civil society and academia provided their views on the current NOU system as well as on the research project itself.
The project coordinators and partners met at a first workshop in October, where plans for data collection and project activities were initiated. The project has also carried out a first round of interviews with participants of public inquiry commissions.

The recruitment of more project participants is well under way. A post-doc researcher and a PhD student will join the EUREX team in 2017. The project has been presented at several occasions, including a presentation of some preliminary findings by project coordinator Johan Christensen at the Partnerforum annual conference in Oslo (see p. 55).

**Funding**
Funded by the Research Council of Norway's DEMOS programme.

**Project period**
1 July 2016–31 June 2020

**Project coordinators**
Cathrine Holst (ARENA) and Johan Christensen (Leiden University)

**ARENA project members**
Åse Gornitzka, Helene Sjursen

**Cooperation**
Kathia Serrano-Velarde, *Heidelberg University*
Peter Munk Christiansen, *Aarhus University*
Bo Rothstein, *University of Gothenburg*

**More:** [arena.uio.no/eurex](http://arena.uio.no/eurex)
Why not epistocracy?  
Political legitimacy and ‘the fact of expertise’

The EPISTO project examines and assesses the legitimacy of expert rule in modern democracies with a particular focus on the EU and European Commission expert groups.

**About**

The EU has recently taken unprecedented administrative and legal measures to address threats of terror, the Euro crisis, and environmental challenges. Critics claim that the Union’s crisis management contributes to pushing the EU further towards technocracy and expert-rule. Is Europe abandoning democracy as we know it? And if so, is this a problem?

A key question for the project *Why not epistocracy? Political legitimacy and ‘the fact of expertise’* (EPISTO) is how to combine democratic procedures with the demands for knowledge-based politics and wide use of experts and expertise. ‘Epistocracy’ refers to ‘rule of the knowers’, and EPISTO elaborates on arguments for expert-rule, tests the soundness of their empirical assumptions, and develops a normative defence of democracy in Europe that specifies the legitimate role and scope of expert power.

**Objectives**

EPISTO will elaborate on different dimensions of knowledge-based rule and develop a typology for epistocracy. The proper standards for assessing the normative legitimacy of expertise arrangements will be discussed and identified. The project will map and analyse the European Commission’s expert group system, its composition and powers with the aim to study expertise behaviour, deliberation and rationality. This system’s normative legitimacy will be discussed and assessed in light of empirical findings.

**Activities in 2016**

The project team has published a range of publications, and research from the project has been presented at a number of seminars and conferences nationally and internationally.

In cooperation with Bo Rothstein, the Quality of Government Institute Gothtenburg and Oxford University, Cathrine Holst organised and chaired the panel ‘Was Plato Right? Should the Experts Rule?’ at the ECPR Joint Sessions in Pisa (see p. 36).

EPISTO also organised the workshop ‘Expertise and Democratic Accountability in Courts and Public Administration’ on 30-31 May 2016 in Rome, in cooperation with the Centre of Excellence PluriCourts and the UiO programme on Democracy as Idea and Practice. The workshop included discussion of 13 papers, including one by Cathrine Holst, and also two keynote lectures by David Dyzenhaus and Heather Douglas.

**Funding**

The EPISTO project reached the final round of the European Research Council’s Starting Grant
competition and was later financed by the Research Council of Norway.

**Project period**
1 July 2012–31 June 2017

**Project coordinator**
Cathrine Holst

**ARENA project members**
Silje H. Tørnblad

**Cooperation**
Fredrik Engelstad, Johan Karlsson Schaffer, Ole Jacob Sending and Hege Skjeie, *University of Oslo*
Margareta Bertilsson and Christian Rostböll, *University of Copenhagen*
Rainer Forst, *Frankfurt University*
Cristina Lafont, *Northwestern University*
Helene Landemore, *University of Yale*
Ulrike Liebert, *University of Bremen*
Kasper Lippert-Rasmussen, *University of Aarhus*
Helen Longino, *Stanford University*

Anders Molander, *Oslo and Akershus University College*
Kalypso Nicolaïdis, *University of Oxford*
Bo Rothstein, *University of Gothenburg*

More: arena.uio.no/episto
Other projects

In addition to projects coordinated by ARENA, the centre’s researchers participate in a number of other international projects and networks.

Parliamentary Democracy in Europe (PADEMIA)

The motivation of PADEMIA is to establish a Europe-wide and sustainable network of 56 academic institutions from 31 countries to promote research and teaching in reaction to growing European demands to study parliamentary democracy in Europe.

PADEMIA seeks to enhance discussion among students, junior and senior researchers, also in exchange with stakeholders, on how to deal with the new challenges parliaments and citizens across Europe are facing today. The network responds to the ‘Future of Europe’ report which identifies ‘(t)he on-going sovereign debt crisis and the ever accelerating process of globalisation (as) an unprecedented dual challenge for Europe’; but also addresses the implications the Lisbon Treaty and further formal agreements (e.g., Fiscal Compact) have for parliamentary democracy in Europe whose complex, multi-level character furthermore requires thorough and comprehensive reflection.

Project type
Erasmus Academic Network funded by the European Commission’s EU Lifelong Learning Programme.

Coordinator
Wolfgang Wessels, University of Cologne

Project period
1 October 2013–30 September 2016

ARENA project members
John Erik Fossum and Christopher Lord

More: www.pademia.eu

Interparliamentary Cooperation in the EU’s External Action (PACO)

Inter-parliamentary Cooperation in the EU’s external action – Parliamentary Scrutiny and Diplomacy in the EU and beyond (PACO) brings together three interrelated teaching and research areas: EU external relations, inter-parliamentary cooperation and parliamentary diplomacy.

PACO aims to discover and explain if and why inter-parliamentary cooperation in the field of external relations (CFSP/CSDP, human rights, development, trade, etc.) has contributed towards increased scrutiny by the European Parliament and national parliaments; and if and why parliamentary diplomacy can add to the diplomatic tool set (i.e. public diplo-
The PADEMIA and PACO networks both study the European Parliament (photo: European Union)

macy) in the EU’s cooperation with third partners via its own delegations at the bilateral and multilateral levels. PACO further aims to contribute to a new understanding of the role of European parliaments (EP, national parliaments) in EU external action.

**Project type**
Jean Monnet Network co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union.

**Coordinator**
Jan Wouters, Leuven Centre for Global Governance Studies, University of Leuven

**Project period**
1 September 2014–31 August 2017

**ARENA project members**
John Erik Fossum, Christopher Lord and Espen D. H. Olsen

**More:** [ghum.kuleuven.be/ggs/projects/paco-project/](ghum.kuleuven.be/ggs/projects/paco-project/)

**Addressing the Needs on Teaching, Education and Research in EU Foreign Policy (ANTERO)**

One of the challenges the EU is confronted with is that of internal and external legitimacy. On internal legitimacy, the Union has been faced with a clear decline in popularity among its citizens. In terms of
its external legitimacy, survey figures show that the EU is a largely unknown actor among the citizens of many third countries. Moreover, those who know the EU are far from unanimously positive about its impact on their country or on international affairs.

ANTERO studies the effectiveness, coherence, and success of the EU as an international actor where both internal and external legitimacy play critical roles. It aims to strengthen the interaction between research in the field of EU foreign policy and the translation of that research through innovative, research-led teaching.

**Project type**
Jean Monnet Network co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union.

**Coordinator**
Ben Tonra, University College Dublin

**Project period**
1 September 2014–31 August 2017

**ARENA project members**
Helene Sjursen, Mai’a K. Davis Cross, Guri Rosén, Marianne Riddervold, Tine E. J. Brøgger, Johanne Døhlie Saltines and Johanna Strikwerda

**More:** [www.eufp.eu/antero](http://www.eufp.eu/antero)

---

**The Academic Research Network on Agencification of EU Executive Governance (TARN)**

TARN is a Europe-wide network of nine academic partners including a multidisciplinary group of scholars from law, social and political sciences and public administration. It aims to contribute to a better understanding of agencification of EU executive governance and to foster dialogue between academics and practitioners to improve scholarship and practice. TARN addresses the many facets of the problems posed by the process of agencification in the EU. It concentrates on three pressing concerns: constitutionality, powers and legitimacy of EU agencies; the role of EU agencies as global actors, and; EU agencies’ functional operation and effectiveness.

**Project type**
Jean Monnet Network co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union.

**Coordinators**
Prof. Ellen Vos, Maastricht University
Prof. Michelle Everson, Birkbeck University of London

**Project period**
1 October 2015–30 September 2018
ARENA project members
Morten Egeberg, Jarle Trondal
More: tarn.maastrichtuniversity.nl

Research and Expertise in Society
ARENA cooperates with the Centre for European Studies at Jagiellonian University in Krakow in establishing a postgraduate research track within an MA programme in European Studies in Krakow: Central and Eastern European Studies: Research Track.

The specialisation is an innovative combination of theory and practical set of skills. Courses are led by academic specialists as well as experts from the private and public sectors. It will allow the students to learn about the mechanism of how the scientific research can be transferred into actions conducive to the development of economy, society and democracy which they will then be able to implement during their internship in NGOs, public or private institutions and companies. The aim is to educate top experts in the field, conscious of their role and responsibilities as researchers.

Project type
Grant from Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway through the EEA and Norway Grants, co-financed by the Polish funds.

Coordinator
Centre for European Studies, Jagiellonian University
Project period  
1 August 2014–31 July 2016

ARENA project members  
Åse Gornitzka, Cathrine Holst, Christopher Lord, Asimina Michailidou, Espen D. H. Olsen and Hans-Jörg Trenz

More: ces.uj.edu.pl/academics/main-european-studies/central-eastern-european-studies-research-track

Democratic Governance and Differentiation in Europe

Slovakia and Norway are examples of countries with various degrees of integration into the EU’s political order. A comparative approach using the two country contexts as a point of departure and extending the research scope towards other country contexts in Europe and beyond provides a fertile ground for the study of differentiation and democratic governance in today’s Europe.

The current project addresses this issue area and seeks to establish lasting cooperation between Comenius University as the leading political science milieu in Slovakia and ARENA at the University of Oslo as a leading European centre of research excellence on democratic governance in Europe.

The project sets up frameworks for the transfer of a successful set of best practices in managing research and teaching excellence on the PhD level in the field of democratic governance. Project activities include lectures, PhD courses, common publications and a guest researcher’s scheme at ARENA.

Project type  
Inter-institutional cooperation project, EEA Grants Scholarship Programme Slovakia.

Coordinator  
Jozef Bátora, Comenius University, Bratislava

Project period  
1 September 2015–31 August 2016

ARENA project members  
John Erik Fossum, Christopher Lord, Johan P. Olsen, Jarle Trondal, Espen D. H. Olsen

More: teritoria.sk/english
New books and special issues 2016

Narrating European Society: Toward a Sociology of European Integration

Hans-Jörg Trenz

This book introduces a sociological perspective on European integration by looking at different accounts of Europeanisation as society building. Trenz describes how European integration has been powerfully launched in postwar Europe as a normative venture that comprises polity and society building; how it became ingrained in every-day life histories and experiences; how it was contested and confronted resistances; and, ultimately, how it went through its most severe crisis.

The book outlines four main themes or narratives of a sociology of European integration. First, the elite processes of identity construction and the framework of norms and ideas that carries such a construction. Second, the socialisation of European citizens, processes of banal Europeanism, and social transnationalism through everyday cross-border exchanges. Third, the mobilisation of resistance and Euroscepticism as a fundamental and collectively mobilised opposition to processes of Europeanisation. And fourth, the political sociology of crisis, linked not only to financial turmoil but also – more fundamentally – to a legitimation crisis that affects Europe and the democratic nation-state.

The UK’s Relationship with Europe: Struggling over Sovereignty

John Todd
Palgrave Pivot, ISBN 978-3-319-33668-8

How has the British discourse on Europe evolved over the past forty years? This book provides a detailed examination of three key periods of the UK-EU relationship, all the way up to Prime Minister David Cameron’s commitment to hold a referendum on EU membership.

In this book, John Todd analyses changes and continuities in the British discourse over three key periods: the 1975 EEC membership referendum, the 1992-3 Maastricht ratification process and the proto-referendum debates of 2013. The consistent divide between a British self and Continental other over the forty years under analysis has been strongly reinforced by the increasing prominence of anti-immigration rhetoric within the discourse.

Cameron’s commitment to hold a referendum on European Union membership was a major political milestone. Todd sheds light on how the issues of immigration and EU membership have become increasingly intertwined, and provides timely context to the ‘Brexit’ debate.

John Todd is a former student at ARENA. This book is a revised version of ARENA Report 1/15: The British Self and Continental Other.
Governance in Turbulent Times
Christopher Ansell, Jarle Trondal, and Morten Øgård (eds)

What are the conditions for political development and decay, and the likelihood of sustained political order? What are the limits of established rule as we know it? How much stress can systems tackle before they reach some kind of limit? How do governments tackle enduring ambiguity and uncertainty in their systems and environments? These are some of the big questions of our time. Governance in turbulent times may serve as a stress-test of well-known ways of governing in the 21st century.

Governance in Turbulent Times discusses this pertinent challenge and suggests how governments and organisations cope with and live with turbulence.

Contributions by ARENA’s staff:
Christopher Ansell and Jarle Trondal, ‘Coping with turbulence’.


Christopher Ansell, Jarle Trondal and Morten Øgård, ‘Turbulent governance’.

Jarle Trondal, ‘Governance in turbulent administrative systems’.

Jarle Trondal, ‘Organized turbulence’.
The European Union’s foreign and security policy

Norsk Statsvitenskapelig Tidsskrift
Vol. 32, no. 4

Ragnhild Louise Muriaas, Marianne Riddervold and Helene Sjursen (eds)

This special issue critically examines the EU’s foreign and security policy. What characterises the cooperation between EU Member States in this policy area? How closely integrated are they, and what does this tell us about the EU as a political entity?

There is a comprehensive literature that discusses what kind of political entity the EU really is, and to what extent the EU has state-like or federal traits. Its foreign and security policy has, however, received only limited treatment in the literature. It is taken for granted that this policy area is quite unaffected by the European Union’s integration processes. But exactly because foreign policy is so closely connected to states’ sovereignty, the degree of integration here is a central aspect in the discussion on what characterises the EU as a political entity.

Dette temanummeret setter kritisk søkelys på EUs utenriks- og sikkerhetspolitikk. Hva kjennetegner samarbeidet mellom EUs medlemsstater på dette politikkområdet? Hvor tett integrert er de, og hva sier dette oss om EU som politisk enhet?

Det fins en omfattende faglitteratur som diskuterer hva slags politisk enhet EU egentlig er, og i hvilken grad EU har statslignende eller føderale trekker. Utenriks- og sikkerhetspolitikken er imidlertid bare i begrenset grad behandlet i denne litteraturen. Det tas for gitt at den er ganske uberørt av integrasjonsprosessene i EU. Men nettopp fordi utenrikspolitikken er så tett knyttet til statens suverenitet, er også graden av integrasjon her et viktig moment i diskusjonen om hva som kjennetegner EU som politisk enhet.

Contributions by ARENA’s staff:

Marianne Riddervold, ‘Et spørsmål om legitimitet. Hvorfor Norge valgte EU foran NATO i kampen mot somaliske pirater’.

Guri Rosén, ‘Kampen for innflytelse: Europaparlamentets påvirkning på EUs utenriks- politikk’.

Helene Sjursen, ‘Integrasjon uten føderasjon: EUs utenriks- og sikkerhetspolitikk’.

Helene Sjursen, ‘Introduksjon til temanummer om EUs utenriks- og sikkerhetspolitikk. Integrasjon og samarbeid i Europa: EUs felles utenriks- og sikkerhetspolitikk som kritisk case’. 
Europe’s Hybrid Foreign Policy: The Ukraine–Russia Crisis

Journal of Common Market Studies
Vol. 55, no. 1

Mai’a K. Davis Cross, Ireneusz Pawel Karolewski (eds)

What impact has the Russia–Ukraine crisis had on the EU as a foreign policy actor? Most studies examine how the EU has evolved as an actor over time of its own initiative, but tend to discount the role that the external context or structure of the international system might play in constraining or enabling the EU’s exercise of power. This Special Issue seeks to understand the EU’s influence in the world through recognizing its embeddedness in an unpredictable and uncertain international system. Specifically, it asks whether and to what extent the Russia–Ukraine crisis serves as a critical juncture and catalyst for shaping the EU’s power.

The Ukraine–Russia crisis is the most serious conflict in Europe since the brutal civil war in the former Yugoslavia, and the most significant confrontation between the West and Russia since the end of the Cold War. Moreover, it is important to recognise that the conflict in Ukraine was fundamentally about the EU. Starting from this assertion, the special issue addresses not only the Ukraine–Russia crisis, but also sheds light on what it means for the future of EU power.

Contributions by ARENA’s staff:


Journal articles

Bølstad, Jørgen and James P. Cross, ‘Not all treaties are created equal: The effects of treaty changes on legislative efficiency in the EU’, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 54(4): 793-808.


Egeberg, Morten and Jarle Trondal, ‘Why strong coordination at one level of government is incompatible with strong coordination across levels (and how to live with it): The case of the European Union’, *Public Administration*, 94(3): 579-592.


Olsen, Johan P., ‘Democratic accountability and the terms of political order’, *European Political Science Review*, 1-19, DOI: 10.1017/S1755773916000084.


Trenz, Hans-Jörg and Anna Triandafyllidou, ‘Complex and dynamic integration processes in Europe: Intra EU mobility and international migration in times of recession’, *Journal of ethnic and migration studies*, 1-14, DOI: 10.1080/1369183X.2016.1251013.


**Book chapters**


Egeberg, Morten, Åse Gornitzka, and Jarle Trondal, ‘Organization theory’, in Christopher Ansell and
Jacob Torfing (eds) *Handbook on Theories of Governance*, Edward Elgar Publishing.


— ‘The European crises as tax crises’, in Jessica Schmidt, Carlos Esplugues and Rafael Arenas García (eds) *EU Law after the Financial Crisis*, Intersentia.


Olsen, Johan P., ‘Democratic order, autonomy and accountability’, in Tom Christensen and


Trenz, Hans-Jörg and Deniz Neriman Duru,

**Book Review**

ARENA Working Papers

The ARENA Working Paper Series publishes pre-print manuscripts by ARENA researchers or from external researchers presenting their research at ARENA seminars.

16/01
John Erik Fossum
Democracy and Legitimacy in the EU: Challenges and Options

16/02
Jarle Trondal
Dissecting International Public Administration

16/03
Morten Egeberg and Jarle Trondal
Agencification of the European Union Administration: Connecting the Dots

16/04
Agustín José Menéndez
Can Brexit Be Turned Into a Democratic Shock? Five Points

16/05
Agustín José Menéndez
The Structural Crisis of European Law as a Means of Social Integration: From the Democratic Rule of Law to Authoritarian Governance
## Publications 2012–2016
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<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
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<td>Monographs</td>
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<td>Edited books</td>
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<td>Special issues of journals</td>
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<td>Journal articles</td>
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<td>ARENA Working Papers</td>
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<td>ARENA Reports</td>
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<td>3</td>
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<tr>
<td>Publication points (total)</td>
<td>47.6</td>
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<td>58.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication points (per academic person-year)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
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<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
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EU Citizenship: Liberal, Communitarian or Cosmopolitan?
ARENA Report 16/01
Veronica Thun

There is broad consensus amongst scholars that EU citizenship has changed and contested traditional statist notions of the concept. The notion of ‘citizenship’ has become more far-reaching and complex, and increasingly borderless. This report analyses the concept of EU citizenship from the viewpoint of the EU’s supranational executive body: the European Commission, attempting to uncover what ideas of citizenship have been most prominent.

The analysis uncovers that the Commission has had a liberal, rights-based understanding of EU citizenship ever since Maastricht. With the enlargement to Eastern Europe and the breakout of the Euro crisis in the 2000s, a more complete idea of EU citizenship emerged. Communitarian notions of the active political citizen and notions of a European identity became of almost equal significance to rights, with some cosmopolitan elements in the background. In short, we have seen a shift from mainly rights-based ideas in the 1990s towards a mix of conceptions of EU citizenship in the beginning of the 2000s.

Nordiske forvaltningsnettverk i en EU-kontekst
ARENA Report 16/02
Astrid Lie Olsen

This report (in Norwegian) deals with the Norwegian central administration’s participation in international networks, with a particular emphasis on why Norwegian bureaucrats maintain their participation in Nordic networks in subject areas where EU networks exist.

Through a case study of the Norwegian Directorate for Civil Protection (DSB), this report examines the degree of overlap and linkages between the Nordic networks and the EU networks within the same subject area. Furthermore, in light of the EU’s increasingly central role and the Nordic networks’ apparent deterioration, why does the DSB maintain its participation in the Nordic networks where EU networks exist?

The study finds a high degree of overlap and linkages between the two types of networks. It shows that the Nordic networks provide advantages that the DSB does not gain in the EU networks. In the field of civil protection, Nordic cooperation has not deteriorated, but on the contrary increased its significance in later years, in parallel with the development in the EU.
Advice from Moral Experts

ARENA Report 16/03
Eilev Hegstad

Moral experts – people who presumably know more about moral issues than others – play an important role in giving advice to governments on how to deal with ethical questions. The existence of ethics committees raises fundamental normative questions concerning the limits and the legitimate role of moral experts in decision-making processes. This report is based on the assumption that moral expertise exists, and that the legitimacy of ethics committees is intimately linked to their members’ performance as moral experts.

The European Group on Ethics in Science and New Technologies (EGE) is composed of philosophers, theologians, lawyers and scientists who give advice on ethical questions. This report evaluates the EGE’s work in the field of animal cloning for food supply by assessing its members’ deliberation on the basis of three concerns: logical validity, empirical soundness and normative reasonableness. Findings suggest that while EGE’s recommendations are logically valid, there are certain shortcomings on empirical soundness. Moreover, as different ethical viewpoints are not presented and the degree of justification is low, the report finds that normative reasonableness is the criterion that the EGE is furthest from meeting.
The TARN working paper series

The TARN network on agencification of EU governance has launched a new working paper series. The first paper is authored by Morten Egeberg and Jarle Trondal.

The working paper series was established in March 2016 and is issued by ARENA Centre for European Studies. The series editors Morten Egeberg and Jarle Trondal work closely with four further members of the TARN network in the editorial board: Giacinto della Cananea, Michelle Everson, Johannes Pollak and Ellen Vos.

The first paper is entitled ‘Agencification of the European Union Administration: Connecting the Dots’. In this review paper, Egeberg and Trondal take stock of the existing literature on EU agencies and suggests a future research agenda.

The series published eight papers in 2016:

16/1 Morten Egeberg and Jarle Trondal
Agencification of the European Union administration: Connecting the dots

16/2 Giandomenico Majone
European integration and its modes: function vs. territory

16/3 Tobias Bach and Eva Ruffing
The multi-level administration of the EU: Transnational coordination through national and supranational bureaucracies

16/4 Arthur Benz
Differentiating multi-level administration: Patterns of administrative co-ordination in the European Union

16/5 Herwig C.H. Hofmann
Agencies in the European Regulatory Union

16/6 Martijn Groenleer
Redundancy in multilevel energy governance: Why (and when) regulatory overlap can be valuable

16/7 Antoine Vauchez
The appeal of independence: Exploring Europe’s way of political legitimacy

16/8 Antonio Calcara
The Agencification in the EU Common Security and Defence Policy: The European Defence Agency
Events
GLOBUS launched in Oslo

Since its inception, the European Union has proclaimed an ambition to promote justice at the global level. But what precisely is the EU’s contribution to global justice?

GLOBUS was launched with a conference of over 100 participants in Oslo on 9 and 10 June 2016. The event brought together scholars from many different parts of the world to discuss the principled and practical dilemmas involved in developing a foreign policy to improve conditions for global justice. It dealt with themes such as climate change and migration, gender justice and capitalism, and not least, the concept of justice itself, with an overall eye for the EU as a global actor and its role in promoting justice.

Visions of justice

In her opening speech, GLOBUS coordinator Helene Sjursen laid out the key questions and framework with which the GLOBUS project engages. The European Union presents itself as a global actor that seeks to promote and safeguard certain values. Representatives of the EU often describe it as one of the most important normative powers in the world. However, there is little agreement on what justice entails. There are competing views not only on how to resolve key challenges in a manner that would be considered just, but also on what those key challenges actually are. What is considered a legitimate claim of justice in the eyes of Europe may collide with perspectives elsewhere in the world.

When analysing the EU’s contribution to global justice, the GLOBUS project develops a conceptual scheme that takes into account the fact that the concept of justice is contested. Erik O. Eriksen delineated the three different conceptions of global justice – non-domination, impartiality, and mutual recognition – that are at the core of the project. These concepts highlight different concerns and imply different answers to problems. The questions of how decisions are made, and who actually makes them, are taken into account, pointing our attention to the underlying structures of power within the global system.

Overcoming injustice

Many accounts of global justice are freestanding, disconnected from a diagnosis of the obstacles to it. Nancy Fraser (New School for Social Research, New York, and member of GLOBUS Scientific Advisory Board), one of the most influential political philosophers of our time, took a different path in her keynote lecture entitled ‘Global Justice against Global Finance’. Starting from an account of the structures of globalising financial capitalism, she proposed an account of justice that can inform, and help to coordinate, struggles against it.

Fraser elaborated on the underlying historical injustices of financial capitalism, emphasising expropriation as a key feature. There is a structural difference
between exploited workers, who are still free citizens, and expropriated subjects. When human beings are expropriated, such as in transnational sex trafficking, they become subjects with no legal personality. The struggle for justice must thus take into account expropriation, as well as exploitation, she argued.

**Justice and policy dilemmas**

Increased flows of migration, climate change, changing patterns of trade and security risks challenge borders and affect peoples’ interests without regard for their status or citizenship. GLOBUS pays particular attention to the EU’s positions and policies in the four crucial areas of climate change, migration, cooperation and conflict, and trade and development. Which conception of justice underpins the EU’s policies in these areas, and how – if at all – does the EU contribute to justice?

Several breakout sessions were devoted to how GLOBUS researchers will investigate the real impact of EU policies within these issue areas. They addressed questions pertaining to where and how concerns for justice figure in the EU’s security strategies; how the EU seeks to incorporate the interest of future generations in its positions on global climate change; the fate of the EU as a champion of justice, as migrants face exclusion while the developed world struggles to implement border mechanisms that will have life or death consequences; the ability of the EU to take heed of third party perspectives when designing its trade agreements.
Justice and gender
Gender equality is a cross-cutting concern in the GLOBUS project. **Karin Aggestam** (Lund University) presented the initiative of the Swedish government for a feminist foreign policy. Its starting point is that women are overrepresented among the world’s poorest, while underrepresented in international positions of power and influence. Female representation is key to a just foreign policy, but equally important are human rights, rule of law, sexual and reproductive rights, as well as economic empowerment of women. This is why representation, rights and resources constitute the three pillars of Sweden’s feminist foreign policy, Aggestam explained.

BRICS’ perspectives
An adequate understanding of global justice must also take into account the competing viewpoints of actors involved. One panel was devoted to discussing the BRICS’ perspectives on global justice. Scholars from Brazil, India, China and South Africa gave challenging and contrasting views on the EU and its putative contribution to global justice.

On the one hand, a post-colonial prism emphasises Europe’s contribution to injustice rather than justice. The end of colonialism does not mean the end of responsibility, it was argued. The discussions exposed perception gaps among the BRICS states. South-South dynamics must for instance also be considered, as there are significant variations.

Some called for a reorganisation of the structures of global governance and pointed to the distribution of power in the United Nations Security Council. On the other hand, the EU is a driver of regional integration and democratisation, which has secured peaceful coexistence of states in Europe. This has served as a model for many regions across the globe.
ARENA organised the first workshop of the research network TARN, on the agencification of EU governance, in Oslo on 1-2 February 2016.

The Jean Monnet network TARN, composed of nine partners from various disciplines, will promote the multi- and interdisciplinary research needed to address the many facets of the problems posed by the agencification process. TARN research will entail perspectives from law, social and political sciences and public administration.

Over two days in Oslo, the project’s first work-shop gathered a range of researchers to discuss these themes. Morten Egeberg chaired the first session while Jarle Trondal chaired the concluding session. The two of them also presented their paper Agencification of the European Union administration: Connecting the dots, which was published as the first TARN Working Paper and as ARENA Working Paper 3/2016 (see p. 26). Åse Gornitzka also presented a paper on the expertise-executive nexus in the European commission.

The workshop’s participants from universities around Europe brought a diverse set of approaches to the study of European agencies. On 29 June 2016, TARN also held a launch event in Brussels which included a presentation by Morten Egeberg.
Should the experts rule?

Cathrine Holst and Bo Rothstein chaired the panel ‘Was Plato Right? Should the Experts Rule’ at the ECPR joint session in Pisa in April.

Democracy is haunted by significant performance problems. At the same time, democratic political rule is challenged in many countries as well as in transnational polities such as the EU by an accelerating expertisation of political processes and policy-making. These real world developments are paralleled by the recent ‘epistemic turn’ in political theory, where familiar normative justifications of democracy are challenged by accounts focusing on decision quality and good outcomes. This raises questions of whether expert rule, or ‘epistocracy’, would be able to outperform democracy as we know it.

A total of 19 papers were presented and discussed over three days at this panel. Several ARENA researchers contributed. Cathrine Holst presented her work on the accountability of experts. Silje H. Tornblad and Guri Rosén presented their paper ‘How does knowledge travel in EU policy-making processes?’ using the case of TTIP as an example, while Eva Krick discussed her paper ‘Reconciling epistemic and democratic legitimacy: a plea for the handpicked selection of participants in policy formulation’.

Expertise in courts and public administration

Cathrine Holst and Silje Aambo Langvatn convened a workshop in Rome on expert behaviour in courts and public administration.

Langvatn and Holst had invited a range of scholars to the Norwegian Institute in Rome on 30 and 31 May. The workshop was a collaboration between ARENA, PluriCourts – Centre for the Study of the Legitimate Roles of the Judiciary in the Global Order, and the Democracy as Idea and Practice programme.

The conveners wished to bring together the parallel debates on the expertisation of public administration, on the one hand, and the debate on juridification and the power of courts, on the other. The aim was to provide for comparison and cross-fertilisation between the different strands of literature.

David Dyzenhaus (University of Toronto) and Heather Douglas (University of Waterloo) were keynote speakers. The workshop included discussions of 13 papers.

The workshop was part of the research project EPISTO, which examines and assesses the legitimacy of expert rule in modern democracies (see p. 10).
Social media and European politics – rethinking power in the digital era

How does social media affect communication and politics in the European Union? In March, ARENA convened a workshop in Oslo to address this issue.

The workshop brought together established and up-and-coming scholars researching social media and political power in Europe across several disciplines. The scholars discussed if and how a power shift is taking place at the level of communication or politics in the European Union due to digital mediatisation.

The participants looked at politics not only from the perspective of EU institutions and political parties but also citizens’ movements, social media mobilisation and public sphere theory.

Democracy and Facebook

John Erik Fossum from ARENA held the keynote lecture, titled ‘Democracy and legitimacy in the EU: challenges and options’. Throughout one and a half day, researchers from the universities of Milan, Vienna, Bratislava, Copenhagen, Oslo, Wrocław, Crete, Lund and Bologna, as well as the Freie Universität Berlin, City University London, New York University and Royal Holloway University of London, participated in intense debate and scholarly exchange. Subjects ranged from the European Parliament’s Facebook page to extreme right online networks’ opposition to the EU in Central and Eastern Europe.

Eli Skogerbo, professor at the University of Oslo’s Department of Media and Communication, held the second keynote lecture, entitled ‘Social media and politics’. Skogerbo is co-editor of the Routledge Companion to social media and politics, which she presented in her talk.

ARENA researcher Asimina Michailidou and Mauro Barisione from the University of Milan convened the workshop. The outcomes of the workshop will be published in the edited volume Social media and European politics as part of the Palgrave Studies in European Political Sociology series.
**Crisis, differentiation and democratic governance in the EU**

ARENA and the Comenius University in Bratislava convened a workshop in Oslo on 31 March.

Scholars from several institutions gathered to discuss the implications of a differentiated EU for the effectiveness and legitimacy of democratic governance in today's Europe.

Jozef Bátor and John Erik Fossum opened the workshop, while Espen D. H. Olsen presented some conceptual considerations on the migration crisis. Asimina Michailidou gave a digital media perspective on the topic. Helene Sjursen discussed the integration and differentiation of EU foreign policy, while Cathrine Holst gave a presentation on epistemic segmentation and expert accountability in EU economic reform discourse. Finally, Erik O. Eriksen focused on the problem of dominance, John Erik Fossum on the parliamentary dimension, and Christopher Lord on the Monetary Union and Brexit, in their respective presentations.

Other participants included Max Steuer (Comenius University), John Gould (Colorado College) and Michael Onderco (Erasmus University Rotterdam).

The workshop was organised as part of the project Democratic Governance and Differentiation in Europe (see p. 16), which came to an end in 2016.

**PhD school on integration, differentiation and crises**

Comenius University in Bratislava organised a PhD Summer School on political integration and differentiation in Europe in June 2016.

The EU as a political structure offers a variety of forms of cooperation and integration. During the Summer School, participants covered each individual form of association and their consequences for the respective member states.

Participating PhD students gained crucial insights from the most up-to-date theoretical developments and analytical approaches within the field of studying institutional change in democratic governance in Europe. At the same time, the Summer School offered PhD students and experienced foreign and Slovak academics a platform to exchange ideas and gain new perspectives on differentiation in Europe.

John Erik Fossum, Espen D. H. Olsen and Bent Sofus Tranøy from ARENA contributed to the academic programme with lectures on the EU’s parliamentary dimension, the political economy of the Eurocrisis and on EU citizenship.

The PhD school was organised as part of the inter-institutional cooperation project Democratic Governance and Differentiation in Europe between ARENA and Comenius University (see p. 16).
The EU and its crises

On 24-25 November John Erik Fossum and Jozef Bátora hosted the workshop ‘The EU and its crises: From resilient ambiguity to ambiguous resilience - or beyond?’ at ARENA. The workshop brought together scholars from ARENA and Comenius University in Bratislava to discuss the impact of the European crises. Workshop conveners Jozef Bátora and John Erik Fossum presented an analytical framework for studying the EU and its crises, which will also form the basis for an edited volume with contributions by the workshop participants.

The participants discussed different crises, from the migration crisis and the Ukraine crisis to the Eurocrisis, and their consequences. The overall theme of differentiated integration informed many of the contributions, as part of the EuroDiv project Integration and division: Towards a segmented Europe? (See p. 2.)

The cooperation between Comenius University and ARENA in this field is a follow-up of the inter-institutional cooperation project on differentiation and democratic governance in the EU (see p. 16).
ARENA Tuesday Seminars

At the ARENA Tuesday Seminars, external scholars as well as ARENA’s own staff are invited to present and defend their work in an inspiring and rewarding academic environment.

26 January 2016
Time to reconsider status: the IMF, the EU, the Euro and its sovereign debt crisis
Jan Wouters, KU Leuven, FRAME coordinator

15 March 2016
Toward rule-based decision-making in international organizations: the effects of committee governance in the United Nations Security Council
Thomas Gehring, Otto-Friedrich-Universität Bamberg

12 April 2016
Linking European and national administration: a Public Administration approach to multilevel governance
Arthur Benz, Technische Universität Darmstadt
This Tuesday seminar was also a TARN lecture

19 April 2016
Normative principles for assigning citizenship in a post-Westphalian world
Joachim Blatter, Professor of Political Science, University of Lucerne

5 April 2016
Measuring and explaining dissent in the EU legislative process
Stéphanie Novak, European School of Political and Social Sciences, Lille

10 May 2016
Rescaling the European state
Michael Keating, University of Aberdeen
6 September 2016
Constitutional Pluralism: chronicle of a death foretold?
Michael Wilkinson, London School of Economics

25 October 2016
Reputation Matters in the regulatory state
Madalina Busuioc, University of Exeter

8 November 2016
An agent of politicization? The role of the European Parliament in the debate on TTIP
Guri Rosén, ARENA

22 November 2016
Populism and technocracy as opposite threats to liberal democracy
Stefan Rummens, KU Leuven
ANTERO workshop

The education and research network ANTERO held its second workshop in London in November.

ANTERO’s second workshop ‘The Quest for External Legitimacy of EU External Action’ was organised by the London School of Economics and Political Science together with ARENA and the University of Maastricht on 16-18 November 2016.

ARENA’s foreign policy group participated with several contributions. Helene Sjursen chaired a research panel, Johanne Døhlie Saltines presented her paper ‘Donor coordination in EU development policy. An attempt to enhance external legitimacy?’ and Marianne Riddervold presented the paper ‘A humanitarian mission to help refugees? Explaining EU naval mission Sophia’ co-authored with Ruxandra-Laura Bosilca (National University for Political Studies and Public Administration, Bucharest).

The workshop also included teaching panels, which circled around the use of simulations. Finally, the workshop included a public conversation on Brexit and the EU global strategy, and a panel on the use of new technologies.
Other conferences and events

ARENA’s staff organised and chaired panels and workshops as part of international academic conferences, in addition to giving invited lectures and academic papers at events organised by a range of research projects, networks and academic institutions.


— Chair of the ‘transatlantic relations workshop’, *European Horizons’ European Student Conference 2016*, New Haven CT, 5-6 February.


— ‘What type of power has the EU exercised in the Ukraine-Russia crisis?’, *Europe’s Parallel Foreign Policy: The Ukraine-Russia Crisis*, Boston MA, 13 April.

— ‘What type of power has the EU exercised in the Ukraine-Russia crisis?’, *23rd International Conference of Europeanists*, Philadelphia PA, 14-16 April.


---


Egeberg, Morten and Jarle Trondal, ‘Agencification of the European administration’, *Nasjonal fagkonferanse i statsvitenskap*, Kristiansand, 6-8 January.


— ‘Alternatives to the EU’, *Understanding European Challenges*, Edinburgh, 16 February.


— ‘Parliaments and legitimacy in the EU: Challenges and options’, *Beyond renationalization and parliamentarization: what ways to overcome the EU’s crisis of democratic representation?*, Frankfurt, 23-24 June.


— ‘Quo vadis Europa?’, *MA lecture for students in journalism*, Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences, Oslo, 29 September.

— Presentation at *GLOBSEC Young Europeans’ Forum: Shaping the Future of Europe*, Bratislava, 28-30 October.


— ‘Marx om kunnskap i statsstyret’, Meeting in the project *Marx, rett og samfunn*, Oslo, 9 February.

— Comment to ‘Democracy, Social Justice and (Mis) Framing: Interlinked Crises of Financialized Capitalism’ by Nancy Fraser, Seminar with Nancy Fraser: *Democracy, Social Justice and (Mis) Framing*, Oslo, 7 June.

— EUREX project presentation, *Meeting in EUREX user forum*, Oslo, 12 September.


— ‘Sosiologi mellom forskning og politikk’, Commencement lecture, Department of Sociology and Human Geography, University of Oslo, 12 December.

Holst, Cathrine, Christensen, Johan, Presentation of the EUREX project, *Programseminar, DEMOS, Research Council Norway*, Oslo, 19 May.


— ‘Debating Brexit’, *Presentation to Academic Debate on Brexit*, Birkbeck College at the University London, 14 June.


Michailidou, Asimina, ‘European politics in the digital era: towards post-representative legitimacy?’, *Communicating Europe seminar*, Aarhus, 10 May.

— ‘EU politics in the social media era: post-legitimacy?’, *Social movements and Europeanisation research group Seminar*, Roskilde, 24 May.


Riddervold, Marianne, ‘Crisis and cooperation: How the Ukraine crisis influenced the EU’s maritime security strategy’, *Europe’s Parallel Foreign Policy: The Ukraine-Russia Crisis*, Boston MA, 13 April.

— ‘EU and the Arctic: Back to Traditional Geopolitics?’. *23rd International Conference of Europeanists*, Philadelphia PA, 14 April.


— ‘Special Issue Framework’ and ‘Unified in response to rising powers? China, Russia and transatlantic
relations’, *Transatlantic Relations*, Berkeley CA, 12 December.

— ‘Book Framework’ and ‘Fighting against sea-borne human smuggling under CSDP: Plain sailing or all at sea? The Case of EUNAVFOR MED (Sophia)’, *Book workshop*, Berkeley CA, 13 December.


on the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership, Gothenburg, 14 March.


Rosen, Guri and Stie, Anne Elisabeth, ‘Accountability in EU security and defence’, *Nasjonal fagkonferanse i statsvitenskap*, Kristiansand, 6 January.


— ‘Not Worth the Net Worth? The Democratic
Dilemmas of Privileged Access to Documents’, 
_UACES 46th Annual Conference_, 5 September.

Saltnes, Johanne Døhlie, ‘EU Development Policy’, 
_Fagdag for utviklingstudier_, University of Oslo, 19 October.


Sjursen, Helene and Rosen, Guri, ‘Not so weak and divided after all?: Making sense of the EU’s responses to the crisis in Ukraine’, _Europe’s Parallel Foreign Policy: The Ukraine-Russia Crisis_, Boston MA, 13 April.

Outreach
Brexit ahead?

In the spring of 2016, the British vote to leave the EU was only a remote possibility. A debate organised by ARENA and British Politics Society asked: What are the implications of the momentous decision – for Britain and for Europe?

In February 2016, British Prime Minister David Cameron concluded a brief and brisk negotiation process by presenting renewed terms for Britain’s membership of the EU. On 23 June it was time for British voters to state their opinion on the issue. We now know that a majority voted in favour of ‘Leave’, which has open the door to an uncertain future, but ‘Remain’ would have posed a raft of challenges as well – and not only within the broadly Eurosceptic Conservative party.

Around 60 people were in the audience on 10 May as Professor Michael Keating from the University of Aberdeen, Professor John Erik Fossum from ARENA, and John Todd from the University of Oslo discussed the upcoming referendum.

Ambiguous outcomes

John Erik Fossum gave an overview first of the referendum process, then on the possible options for a 'brexited' Britain. He argued that the reality is often more complex than the wording of a referendum, making the outcome unclear even if the wording on the ballot was clear enough. A historical analogy is the 1994 Norwegian referendum on EU membership, where the EEA Agreement was one of the factors making an initially clear yes-no issue ambiguous. It is often said that the No-side won at the day of the referendum, but has lost every day since.

He went on to consider the Norwegian and Swiss models of EU affiliation, and argued that closely affiliated states such as Norway lose both co-determination and self-determination, making non-membership a form of self-imposed hegemony. Fossum argued that it is unclear whether the UK’s size is sufficient to upset the weight of this structure. The scope for British exceptionalism remains an open question.

Lastly, Fossum considered possible Norwegian responses to a British exit from the EU. A “Brexit” UK is bound to have implications for Norway. Either the UK enters into a separate agreement, which could either marginalise the EEA or lead to a harmonisation between the two, or the UK joins the EEA. This could have profound effects on the EEA Agreement as such, and the question remains, how similar are the interests of the UK and the EEA countries?

England against the rest?

Professor Michael Keating expressed scepticism towards the numerous economic calculations within the Brexit debate, because they were all uncertain. He underlined that the debate was very narrowly focused in the sense that it focused on costs and benefits for the UK of staying in the EU but was quite silent
on the implications for Europe and on what kind of Europe would be desirable. He also brought up the internal relations inside the UK and possible tensions that may arise within the UK if there were to be a yes vote. It is conceivable that a yes vote could pit England against the other regions because Scotland most likely will vote no to Brexit, Keating said.

**Changes since 1975**

John Todd provided a comparison between the previous UK referendum on EEC membership, which took place in 1975, drawing out three similarities and three differences between the current campaign and its predecessor.

The three similarities he highlighted were the ability of EEC/EU membership to divide political parties, the focus on the economic implications of membership and the continued salience of the issue of sovereignty. In terms of key differences, Todd drew attention first to the different context across the continent, second the rise of populist voices and of the salience of immigration, and third the changed media landscape in the UK.
Freedom and responsibility in Europe

In a packed auditorium at the University of Oslo, Norwegian Minister of Foreign Affairs Børge Brende gave the ARENA Lecture 2016.

The lecture was held on 13 September and attracted more students than could fit in the Faculty of Social Sciences’ largest auditorium. Minister Brende spoke about the security challenges threatening Europe today and how they affect Norwegian priorities.

Brende reminded us that during the second world war, Europe was the Middle East of its time. It was in this part of the world six million Jews were murdered in concentration camps. Many are worried that history may repeat itself if crises are not tackled the right way.

The author Stefan Zweig wrote that he grew up in Europe in the golden age of freedom. This was right before the Great War. The Minister claimed that we can look at our own childhood as another such ‘golden age’.

Millions gained access to freedom

Brende pointed to all the positive developments in Europe the last few decades. ‘After the fall of the Berlin wall, millions of Europeans gained access to freedom. The German Chancellor Helmut Kohl was eager to grab this chance. First with necessary cooperation, then reconciliation, and finally a reunited Germany’.

NATO, the EU, and the European Council

Brende said that transatlantic cooperation with the US was crucial to Europe. ‘Europe strived to become Pan-European. Today, our foremost goal is to protect our freedom. The reason people are interested in foreign and security policy is because everybody knows how important it is to us. Through that policy, we can influence other parts of the world’.

Europe has established a supranational system that is unique in the world. NATO is the framework of the American security guarantee. The Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) has played a key role in sending observers to Ukraine.

The European Council has guarded the European Convention on Human Rights, and made sure that its member states have respected human rights, good governance and democratic values. And lastly, Brende mentioned the Nordic community of states. They have in common an open economy and competitive yet relatively egalitarian societies.

The world moves forward

‘Last year, almost every country in the world agreed on a climate agreement in Paris. The Iran deal was made, which prevents Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. And who would have thought a year ago that US President Obama would travel to Cuba and visit President Raúl Castro only half a year later? In Myanmar, Nobel peace prize laureate Aung San-Suu Kyi in practice runs the country. Sri Lanka also has a
new and better government’, Brende said. He added that the global poverty rate has decreased from 40 percent in 1990 to 20 percent today.

But not everything gets better, not even in Europe. Last summer and the year before saw several terrorist attacks in Europe. Brende stated that people’s freedom is threatened by hate speech, harassment and breaches of international law. Two years ago, Crimea was invaded by Russia. This is the first time since the second world war a European country has annexed a territory of another European country. Crimea was a legitimate part of Ukraine, Brende maintained.

A win-win relationship

Brende worried that more and more people in Europe believe in easy solutions to complex problems. The trust in representative democratic bodies today is low.

Now, the role and composition of the EU is discussed after the popular vote in Britain to leave the EU.

‘Brexit has consequences for Norway too’, Brende said. ‘Great Britain is our largest export market, but also the world’s fifth most important economy. We cannot cling onto the same map if the terrain has changed drastically’.

Brende has one important goal for European politics: ‘It must be a win-win relationship,’ he concluded. ‘If I’m doing well, you’re doing well. We need to carry this mentality on to the coming generations’.

Long-standing tradition

The ARENA Lecture is a long-standing tradition at the University of Oslo. In this lecture series ARENA invites politicians and other influential persons to hold an open lecture on a topic that is both of academic and public interest. See video on arena.uio.no
Debating EU citizens’ trust in the European project

John Erik Fossum discussed the crisis of EU citizens' trust towards the European project at the Tatra Summit 2016.

The international conference GLOBSEC Tatra Summit 2016 welcomed around 1,300 guests to Bratislava in October. It took place during the first ever Slovak Presidency in the Council of the European Union and is considered an important public event during this period.

During the four conference days, 100 speakers from 50 countries – including eight ministers of finance and foreign affairs and a number of special guests – brainstormed around and discussed a number of topics: the migration crisis, Brexit, energy security, building the Economic and Monetary Union, strengthening European internal security, combating financial criminality and fighting extremism.

How to rebuild the trust of EU citizens?

ARENA’s John Erik Fossum contributed to the debate on the crisis of trust of the EU citizens towards the European project. The panel also included Vivien A. Schmidt – professor at the Boston University, Goran Buldioski – co-director of the Open Society Initiative for Europe, and Daniel Milo – senior research fellow at the GLOBSEC Policy Institute.

Fossum argued that the lack of trust in politics, state, and media, is widespread. Populist parties captured hearts and minds of citizens who are afraid of globalisation. In particular, they fear a lack of social stability due to increased immigration – a fear of being left behind. The sense of injustice and the feeling that politicians do not deal with real problems of real people bring citizens to populist ideas and disrupt the belief in the European Union.

A bottom-up revival

Furthermore, it is possible to observe two different realities presented by politicians – one behind the closed doors in Brussels and the other on the national stage. Experts are denigrated to irrelevant ‘taste judges’. And while the EU might have the best rock stars, national governments focus on their drug habits rather than music. In order to re-establish legitimacy within the EU, it is necessary to rethink the social contract on the level of institutions as well as of individuals.

The EU and politicians should start listening to citizens; the Union needs a bottom-up revival of its policies. Mainstream politicians need to challenge populism by talking about trust, solidarity and sovereignty.

‘The blame game is enormously destructive for the EU’, Fossum said. ‘It is a must to develop a positive inclusive vision of the EU’s future’.

See video on arena.uio.no
Between research and policy

EUREX coordinator Johan Christensen gave a lecture on public inquiry commissions at the Partnerforum Autumn conference.

On 18 November, the largest auditorium at Georg Sverdrup’s house was filled with bureaucrats. The relationship between research and policy was on the agenda – and rarely have so many ministries been represented on Blindern at the same time.

Johan Christensen is an Assistant Professor at Leiden University, and is also one of the coordinators of the project EUREX: Expertisation of public inquiry commissions in a Europeanised administrative order with Cathrine Holst (see p. 8). ‘We know little about what really happens when research and policy meet’, Christensen said. There is little research on the issue. Together with Holst, he will as part of the EUREX project investigate the use of researchers in public inquiries.

He pointed out a few developments: An increasing use of researchers as members and leaders of inquiry commissions, more academic commission reports – but at the same time, there are few signs that the ministries’ control over the inquiry commissions is weakened.

See video on arena.uio.no
Another Europe is emerging: Winners and losers

Around a hundred participants from different ministries and organisations participated in a Research Council of Norway seminar on 4 November.

Europe faces greater uncertainty than it has in years. The Eurozone crisis is not yet over and new challenges have arrived. Brexit, the debt crisis, the migration crisis, high unemployment rates – much is at stake in Europe in 2016. Which Europe emerges? What are the implications for Norway? What about the EEA agreement? These were among the questions asked at the seminar.

Brexit, Norway and the EEA

Christopher Lord gave a presentation entitled ‘Why “Brexit” may change much for the UK and little for Norway’. Many hope that Brexit may be an opportunity to reconfigure arrangements between the EU and non-member states. The main effect of Brexit on UK politics, he argued, may be to remove any stable equilibrium on EU questions. This would make it hard for any UK government to back innovative solutions to relationships between the EU and non-member states.

Senior researcher at the Centre for European Law, UiO and NUPI, Christophe Hillion, gave a legal appraisal of Brexit. He emphasised that the outcome of the Brexit referendum may not only change the state configuration of the Union – it may also prompt new forms of intra-European cooperation.

Migration and the right to asylum

Agustín J. Menéndez gave a presentation on migration called ‘The refugee crisis and european integration’. After the second world war, European states solemnly proclaimed the right to seek asylum. This was a major normative achievement. Why is the right to asylum now in shatters?

Other areas covered in the seminar were energy policy with a presentation from Ole Gunnar Austvik (NUPI), negotiations and coordination within a union by Katinka Holtsmark, and macroeconomics by Halvor Mehlum (both Dept. of Economics, UiO).

Project leaders

Erik O. Eriksen leads ARENA's EuroDiv project (see p. 2). The seminar concluded with a panel that included Eriksen along with Kalle Moene, the leader of the project European Strains at the University of Oslo’s Department of Economics, and Pernille Rieker, who leads the EUNOR project at NUPI. The seminar was organised as part of the Research Council of Norway’s programme ‘Europe in Transition’.
The Global Justice Blog

A part of the GLOBUS project is the global justice blog. This is an academic commentary that aims to enhance debates on, and understandings of, global justice.

The blog is edited by ARENA’s Johanne Døhlie Saltnes. It contains posts on topics ranging from the World Trade Organization to women’s rights. Helene Sjursen wrote the blog’s first post, where she introduced the GLOBUS project.

An ongoing series in the blog deals with the recently launched EU Global Strategy. Here, Mai’a K. Davis Cross (ARENA and Northeastern University) argues that diplomacy is one of the clearest strengths of the global strategy. Ben Tonra (University College Dublin) presents three challenges for the EU Global Strategy, and argues that resilience is a promising concept for EU foreign policy.

Other posts include Hayley Walker (KU Leuven) on the 2015 Paris agreement, Johanne Døhlie Saltnes on the EU’s development policy, Cathrine Holst (ARENA/UiO) on the 1995 and 2015 UN Conferences on Women, and Kjartan Koch Mikalsen (ARENA and Nord University) and Johanne Døhlie Saltnes on the WTO in light of global justice theories.

Go to: globus.uio.no/resources/global-justice-blog
First meeting of the EUREX user forum

On 12 September, the EUREX user forum held its first meeting.

The user forum consists of researchers, senior bureaucrats, politicians, and representatives from civil society, with experience from many parts of the NOU system.

The EUREX project leaders, Johan Christensen and Cathrine Holst, first introduced the project. Its main objectives are to map how the Norwegian public inquiry (NOU) system has changed in response to processes of expertisation and Europeanisation, and to examine the consequences of these changes (see p. 8). They also presented a pilot study of the NOUs within the Ministry of Finance.

Jon Hippe, Research Director at FAFO; Kristin Clemet, former Minister of Education and now the leader of the think tank Civita; and Arnulf Tverberg, Deputy Director General at the Ministry of Justice and Public Security, gave introductory remarks. They pointed out several key distinctions. There is for instance a difference between pure expert commissions and commissions where the affected parties are represented; politicians’ reasons for appointing a commission may differ; legal and policy commissions may function differently.

After the prepared remarks, the floor opened to a general debate. Participants commented both on the NOU system as they experienced it, and on the EUREX project itself.

Other outreach activities


– Commentary, Book launch: Krise og medansvar, Oslo, 26 October.

– Commentary, Book launch: Fryktens kontinent, Oslo, 3 May.


– Panelist on Norwegian family policy, Panel/breakfast meeting, Oslo, 28 September.

Lord, Christopher, Presentation on Brexit to Norway’s largest bank, DNB, 24 May.


Media contributions

As a centre for research on issues directly affecting European citizens, ARENA aims to reach out beyond the research community. The staff contribute to the public debate in print and broadcast media, commenting upon topical issues with research-based knowledge.

Op-eds
Muerte accidental de un pensionista, Agustín J. Menéndez, infoLibre, 14 January
Bestialitet eller humanitet?, Erik O. Eriksen, Vårt Land, 2 February
Krise og solidaritet, Erik O. Eriksen, Forskning.no, 9 March
Brexit – er det mulig? Erik O. Eriksen, Aftenposten, 6 May
What does Norway do?, John Erik Fossum, Prospect Magazine, 6 June
La verdad, toda la verdad y nada más que la verdad sobre el Brexit, Agustín J. Menéndez, infoLibre, 10 June
En helt vanlig utredning, Cathrine Holst, Agenda Magasin, 26 June
Fiksjonen om et alternativ, Erik O. Eriksen, Bladet Vesterålen, 11 August
Brexit og Europas grenser, Jarle Trondal, Fædrelandsvennen, 23 September

Hvordan styre under turbulente tider? Jarle Trondal, Universitetet i Agder, 20 December

Blogs and comments
Hvordan sikre den evige fred? Erik O. Eriksen, Erik O. Eriksen’s blog, 14 January
Brexit Debate: Lessons from the EU’s Non-members, Erik O. Eriksen and John Erik Fossum, European Futures, 27 May.
Should I stay or should I go? John Erik Fossum, Centre on Constitutional Change, 27 May
Reconsidering European Contributions to Global Justice, Helene Sjursen, Global Justice Blog, 6 June
A crucial year for EU development policy, Johanne Døhlie Saltnes, Global Justice Blog, 19 September
Hvem skal løse Europas problemer? Og har vi et alternativ til EU? Erik O. Eriksen, Tja til EU, 26 September
The EU Global Strategy and diplomacy, Mai’a Cross, Global Justice Blog, 21 November

Interviews based on own research
Leder EU-prosjekt om global rettferdighet til 22 millioner, Helene Sjursen, Khrono, 11 November

News commentaries and expert opinions
– Mer sannsynlig at Norge blir medlem enn at EU kollapser, Cathrine Holst, Klassekampen [interview], 2 January
– Det rakner fra flere hold, Erik O. Eriksen, E24 [interview], 3 January

Statsviter: -Det er «vill vest» i asylpolitikken i Europa, Erik O. Eriksen, VG [interview], 6 January

– Skammelig at steinrike Norge ikke gjør mer, Erik O. Eriksen, NRK [interview], 18 January

Statsviter: -Det er «vill vest» i asylpolitikken i Europa, Erik O. Eriksen, VG [interview], 6 January

Pensjonssmell for Hellas, Asimina Michailidou, Dagavisen [interview], 21 January

Tror ikke på Schengen-kollaps, Espen D.H. Olsen, Dagens Næringsliv [interview], 28 January

Frykter for UiAs renommé, Jarle Trondal, fnv.no [interview], 30 January

EU vurderer å sette «det grensefrie Europa» til side i to år, Erik O. Eriksen, Aftenposten [interview], 12 February

Gjør EU mindre fristende, Erik O. Eriksen, Klassekampen [interview], 23 February

– Det er en risiko for at hele systemet faller fullstendig sammen, Asimina Michailidou, Aftenposten [interview], 26 February

Eksperter om flyktningekrisen: Norge tjener på at andre land krangler, Erik O. Eriksen, VG [interview], 26 February

– Et brudd med det Norge har stått for før, Erik O. Eriksen, VG [interview], 1 March

Matlary: -Eu er totalt ute av stand til å holde kontroll på Schengen-grensen, Erik O. Eriksen, VG [interview], 3 March

Det som skjer i Europa nå, er helt fryktelig, Erik O. Eriksen, Aftenposten [interview], 6 March

Flyktningekrisen: -Dette blir neppe et vakkert syn, Erik O. Eriksen, MSN NO Nyheter [interview], 7 March

EU-hatet bygges opp, Asimina Michailidou, Klassekampen [interview], 8 March

– Utrolig sjenerøse grekere, Asimina Michailidou, Dagsavisen and Rogalands Avis [interview], 18 March

Kan vrake EU-avtale, Johanna Strikwerda, Nationen [interview], 6 April

Risikerer bøter for asylnekt, Erik O. Eriksen, Dagens Næringsliv [interview], 6 May

Tsipras i kreditorskvis, Asimina Michailidou, Klassekampen [interview], 10 May

Den samme gordiske knuten, Asimina Michailidou, Dagens Næringsliv [interview], 10 May

– Europas neste flyktningestrøm kommer ikke fra Syria, Erik O. Eriksen, Aftenposten [interview], 10 May
– EU-motstanden baserer seg på en fiksjon om selvråderett

Should I Stay or Should I Go? John Erik Fossum, Vårt Land [interview], 11 May
– Jeg er veldig skeptisk, Asimina Michailidou, Dagens Næringsliv [interview], 25 May
Nye lån mot vage løfter, Asimina Michailidou, Klassekampen [interview], 26 May
EU-topp advarer mot tettere EU, Espen D.H. Olsen, Nationen [interview], 7 June
Norway: A Model for Brexit? John Erik Fossum, BBC World Service [radio interview], 14 June
Hva om britene vil ut? Slik starter en «brexit», Erik O. Eriksen, E24 [interview], 19 June
Her er din Brexit-guide, Erik O. Eriksen, VG [interview], 22 June
Dette tror ekspertene blir utfallet, Jarle Trondal, VG [interview], 22 June
Inside Europe: Brexit from a non-EU Norwegian perspective, Erik O. Eriksen, Deutche Welle [radio interview], 22 June
Dette tror ekspertene blir utfallet, Erik O. Eriksen, VG [interview], 22 June
Derfor er brexit viktig for deg: Åtte konsekvenser for Norge, Erik O. Eriksen, VG [interview], 23 June
Britene har talt: Vil forlate EU, Erik O. Eriksen, VG [interview], 24 June 2017
Professor: Cameron ferdig som statsminister, Erik O. Eriksen, VG [interview], 24 June
Offisielt: Brexit har vunnet, Erik O. Eriksen, P4 [interview], 24 June

Slik blir brexit i praksis – steg for steg, Erik O. Eriksen, VG [interview], 24 June


Ekspertene frykter Brexit skal gi domino-effekt: Frankrike neste land ut? Erik O Eriksen, VG [interview], 24 June

Lahlum: – Det største grasrotoppgjøret i moderne tid, Erik O. Eriksen, ABC Nyheter [interview], 24 June

Slik skiller du deg fra EU – steg for steg, Erik O. Eriksen, VG [interview], 24 June

Slik blir Storbritannias skilsmisse med EU, Erik O. Eriksen, ABC Nyheter [interview], 24 June

Slik splitter brexit Storbritannia, Erik O. Eriksen, VG [interview], 24 June

Spetalen om «brexit»: -Britene er vinnere, Erik O. Eriksen, E24 [interview], 24 June

EU-forskar Erik Oddvar Eriksen: -Ikkje overraska over Brexit, Erik O. Eriksen, Uniforum [interview], 24 June

Dominoeffekt: -Storbritannia kan bli oppløst på sikt, Erik O. Eriksen, MSN NO [interview], 24 June

Bruddansvisningen, Erik O. Eriksen, VG [interview], 25 June

7 spørsmål og svar om skilsmisse-oppgjøret mellom EU og britene, Helene Sjursen, Aftenposten [interview], 25 June

Rådyr skilsmisse, Erik O. Eriksen, Dagsavisen and Rogalands Avis [interview], 26 June

Brexit, grexit, eller..., Erik O. Eriksen, VG [interview], 26 June

Europa venter på «paragraf 50». 261 ord dikterer nå Storbritannias EU-framtid, Erik O. Eriksen, Dagbladet [interview], 27 June

Britisk minister vil ha Norges EU-avtale, men med mindre innvandring, Erik O. Eriksen, VG [interview], 28 June.

Storbritannia skader seg selv, Jarle Trondal, Universitetet i Agder [interview], 1 July

En hissig stormakt, Erik O. Eriksen, Klassekampen [interview], 2 July

Rapport kaller mulig britisk EØS-avtale for en «kolonimodell», John Erik Fossum, NTB [interview], 4 July

Brexit kan svekke EUs klimainnsats, John Erik Fossum, Agderposten [interview], 4 July
– EU-motstanden baserer seg på en fiksjon om selvråderett, Erik O. Eriksen, Bladet Vesterålen [interview], 9 July

Mener EU vil leve godt med Brexit-krisen, Jarle Trondal, Forskning.no [interview], 9 July

Folket har talt, men ..., Erik O. Eriksen, Adresseavisen [interview], 12 July


Gikk det som de trodde? Cathrine Holst, Morgenbladet [interview], 22 July

Seierherren Erdogan kan være statslederen Erdogan's verste fiende, Erik O. Eriksen, Ukeavisen Ledelse [interview], 22 July

En varslet katastrofe, Asimina Michailidou, Klassekampen [interview], 6 August

Samler troppene før Brexit, Erik O. Eriksen, Dagens Næringsliv [interview], 22 August

Samles ved graven uten klar kurs videre, Erik O. Eriksen, E24 [interview], 22 August

Må samle seg etter Brexit, Erik O. Eriksen, Dagsavisen and Rogalands Avis [interview], 23 August

Ber om vitenskapelig råd, Cathrine Holst, Morgenbladet [interview], 9 September

– Spørsmål om Brexit er vidåpent, Jarle Trondal, Universitetet i Agder [interview], 9 September
Truer EU med nye opprør, Erik O. Eriksen, Klassekampen [interview] 9, 16 September

Bahamas Leaks: Ikke første gang Neelie Kroes blir avslørt for hemmelighold, Jarle Trondal, Aftenposten [interview], 22 September

–Vi har ikke en hemmelig politistyrke som kan sendes til Bahamas, Jarle Trondal, Aftenposten [interview], 23 September

Drakampen om likelønn, Cathrine Holst, Kilden [interview], 29 September

Hellas må selge unna milliarder – krefter i regjeringen kjemper imot, Asimina Michailidou, E24 [interview], 8 October

Professor: EU overlever utan euro, Erik O. Eriksen, Fiskeribladet Fiskaren [interview], 28 November

Folkeavstemning i Italia og Østerrikes presidentvalg, John Erik Fossum, TV2 Nyhetskanalen [TV], 5 December

Illevarslende Oppslutningm Erik O. Eriksen, VG [interview], 5 December

Renzi måtte gå i Italia: –Jeg vet strengt tatt ikke hva som er godt for landet mitt lenger, John Erik Fossum, VG [Interview], 7 December

Vi er utro EØS-tilhengere, Erik O. Eriksen, Klassekampen [interview], 24 December
Organisation and staff
Personnel and economy

As a research centre based at the Faculty of Social Sciences at the University of Oslo, the main part of ARENA’s budget is financed by external funding sources. In 2016, the centre’s main sources of external funding were the Research Council of Norway, the EU’s Horizon 2020 programme, the Norwegian Ministry of Defence and the Norwegian Ministry of Local Government and Modernisation.

Key figures 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professors including research professors (work years)</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior researchers and post docs (work years)</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD fellows</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA students</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative staff</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total budget (NOK million)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External financing</td>
<td>74 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ARENA Board

Chair

Magnus Gulbrandsen
Centre for Technology, Innovation and Culture (TIK), University of Oslo

Board members

Ingvild Marheim Larsen
Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research

Asbjørn Seim
Norwegian Ministry of Local Government and Modernisation

Steinar Stjernø
Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences

Marit Eldholm
Espen D. H. Olsen
Staff representatives

Deputy members for staff representatives:
Johanne Døhlie Saltnes and Jørgen Bølstad

ARENA Management

ARENA Director

Prof. Erik Oddvar Eriksen
Eriksen has been professor at the University of Tromsø and the University of Bergen, and professor II at the Centre for the Study of Professions at Oslo University College as well as at the University of Aalborg.

Eriksen’s main research fields are political theory, public policy and European integration. His interest in legitimate rule has led to publications on democracy in the EU, governance and leadership, functions and limits of the state, deliberative democracy, trust, regional politics, security politics and the welfare state.

Administrative Director

Ida Hjelmesæth
Hjelmesæth has worked in ARENA’s research administration since 2008, and has acted as Administrative Director since September 2015.
Academic staff

**Dr. Jørgen Bølstad**
Research: Political economy, political psychology, democratic representation, quantitative methods, time series analysis.

**Prof. John Erik Fossum**
Research: Political theory, democracy and constitutionalism in the EU and Canada, Europeanisation, nation-state transformation

**Prof. Cathrine Holst**
Research: Political theory, philosophy of social science, the role of expertise in the EU, gender equality policies, feminist theory and gender studies

**Prof. Christopher Lord**
Research: Democracy, legitimacy and the EU, political parties in the EU, the history of Britain and Europe, the political economy of the monetary union

**Dr. Asimina Michailidou**
Research: Public sphere theory, political and public communication, globalization and political activism, online media and impact on EU politics

**Dr. Espen D. H. Olsen**
Research: European citizenship, EU integration, citizen deliberation, deliberative democracy, the Eurocrisis, political theory, qualitative methods

**Prof. Emeritus Johan P. Olsen**
Research: Organisational decision-making, New Institutionalism, democracy, power and the Scandinavian model, the changing political organisation of Europe

**Dr. Marianne Riddervold**
Research: International Relations and European integration, the foreign and security policy of the EU, the EU as an international actor

*Research stay at the Institute of European Studies, University of California, Berkeley (Until July)*

**Dr. Guri Rosén**
Research: EU’s external trade policy, the Common Foreign and Security Policy, the European Parliament
Prof. Helene Sjursen
Research: The EU as an international actor, the EU’s foreign and security policy, EU enlargement, democratic aspects of foreign and security policy

Dr. Nina Merethe Vestlund
Research: public administration, EU regulatory networks, the European Commission, EU agencies, and national regulatory agencies

August–December

Part-time

Dr. Mai’a K. Davis Cross
Professor, Political Science, Northeastern University
Research: European foreign and security policy (CFSP/CSDP), diplomacy, public diplomacy, soft/smart power

Prof. Morten Egeberg
Professor, Department of Political Science, University of Oslo
Research: The role of organisational factors in political systems, the European Commission, the relationship between the EU and the national levels, EU agencies and national executives

Prof. Åse Gornitzka
Professor, Department of Political Science, University of Oslo
Research: European education and research policy, the role of expertise in EU policy-making, the domestic impact of the EU’s soft modes of governance

Prof. Agustín José Menéndez
Profesor Contratado Doctor Permanente I3, University of León
Research: Democracy, fundamental rights, legitimacy, EU constitutional theory, national vs. EU law, the EU’s social dimension

Prof. Hans-Jörg Trenz
EURECO Professor, Centre for Modern European Studies, University of Copenhagen
Research: European public sphere and civil society, cultural and political sociology, migration and ethnic minorities, European civilisation and identity

Prof. Jarle Trondal
Professor, University of Agder
Research: EU as a political system, administrative integration/transformation, EU/EEA and Norway, European Commission, EU committee governance
**PhD fellows**

**Tine Elisabeth Johnsen Brøgger**
PhD project: ‘The EU in crisis: Implications for the Common Security and Defence Policy’

**Johanne Døhlie Saltines**
PhD project: ‘Political conditionality in the EU cooperation agreements with the ACP states’

**Helena Seibicke**
PhD project: ‘Women’s advocacy at the EU level’

**Johanna Strikwerda**
PhD project: ‘Pushing the boundaries of inter-governmentalism? The role of the Commission in the CFSP’

**Silje H. Tørnblad**
PhD project: ‘The European Commission’s expert groups: More than expertise?’
*Research stay at the Department of Political Science, University of California, Berkeley, until June*

**Guest researchers**

**Ruxandra-Laura Boşilcă**
*PhD Candidate, The National University of Political Studies and Public Administration, Romania*
Project: ‘Building Governance in the Maritime Domain’
*August*

**Maximilian Conrad**
*Associate Professor, University of Iceland*
Project: ‘Opportunities and constraints of the European Citizens’ Initiative’
*June*

**Morgane Gertz-Roger**
*PhD student, Centre for International Studies, Sciences Po Paris*
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