

1st and 2nd term, Academic Year 2023 – 2024

Europe in the World

Given by Stephanie Hofmann

The programme of each seminar can be also consulted [here](#).

Brightspace: <https://mycourses.eui.eu/d2l/home/13499>

Contact: sofia.altesini@eui.eu

In this two-semester long seminar, where we will meet more or less every other week, we will address three broad topics: (1) AI and technological developments, (2) migration and bordering practices as well as (3) enlargement and other forms of institutional cooperation. These topics will be discussed by listening to and discussing cutting-edge scholarship. Every week but the introduction week, a guest speaker will present work-in-progress that addresses at least one of the three topics.

Each seminar will start with a 30-minute discussion among enrolled seminar participants and the seminar instructor before we open the floor to the 1,5-hour presentation and Q&A with the guest speaker. Each seminar participant will at least once take on the role of discussant and “resident expert”.

The main goals of the seminar are to (1) familiarize researchers with cutting-edge scholarship in their discipline, (2) consider the ropes of how to present work-in-progress, (3) discuss academic work constructively and learn about the substantive research areas.

Course requirements consist of:

- Carefully reading the circulated material before the talk
- Short presentation that helps situate the scholars’ scholarship (1x)
- Discussant (1x)

5 October (15:00-17:00): Introduction

19 October (15:00-17:00): Why legal form and funding models matter in advocacy

Guest speaker: **Nina Hall** (SAIS Europe)

Discussant: Dominik Rehbaum

A large, rich scholarship in international relations (IR) has sought to explain advocacy organisations behavior, and their impact on international affairs. Scholars have investigated differences: in the norms organisations champion, as well as their tactics (radical/moderate), strategies (insider/outsider), and decision-making processes (decentralised vs centralised). However, IR scholars have not examined variation in their: 1) legal status and 2) funding models. Advocacy organisations can register as charities or political entities; and can be funded by philanthropic grants or member-donations. In this seminar, Nina Hall will draw on existing research on NGOs, not-for-profits, and political communications to illustrate why legal form and funding models help explain the behavior of advocacy organisations, their accountability structures, and vulnerability to government restrictions. IR scholarship should not examine global trends in repression of NGOs, but also how advocacy organisations can respond to this shrinking civic space by changing their funding models and/or legal status.

2 November (15:00-17:00): Nomadic (counter)mapping: motioning migration-security nexuses

Guest speaker: **Jef Huysmans** (Queen Mary, University of London)

Discussant: Nora Soederberg

The seminar explores an agenda of motioning the politics of (in)security by analysing how techniques of mapping migration work within and upon security-migration nexuses. Motioning the politics of (in)security comes to the question of security and migration by focusing on how mapping methods produce particular conceptions of movement in producing spatial knowledge and artefacts. More specifically, the seminar reflects on how taking a Lucretian point of view that understands life and matter as essentially in motion transmutes the international and humanitarian security conceptions of movement-space through which migration and its regulatory possibilities are imagined and conducted. To that purpose, the seminar discusses a distinctive mapping mode, nomadic counter-mapping, which disrupts cartographic practices working with sedentarising grids and network conceptions of movement. Reading migration-security nexuses through debates and practices of counter-mapping places 'mapping' directly in a politicised context of struggles, contestations, and disagreements over representations and narrations of migration and modes of governing it.

16 November (15:00-17:00): Europe's long twentieth century

Guest speaker: **Peo Hansen** (Institute for Research on Migration, Ethnicity and Society)

Discussant: Anastasia Prokhorova

The lecture takes its point of departure in the EU's current geopolitical turn. For many scholars and commentators, this turn is hugely significant since it supposedly marks a shift away from the EU's uniquely liberal approach to world affairs. Equally important, by openly embracing 'hard power' Brussels is also severing the continuity between the present rhetoric and its founding narrative about the EU as an anti-geopolitical peace project. But as will be shown, what appears to be a break with the past is, in fact, a reunion with the past. The current debate is thus not new but echoes earlier calls for a geopolitics of European unity that commenced already in the pre-World War I period. Indeed, today's geopolitical affirmation follows in the very footsteps of the EU's founders. Few contemporary scholars and policy makers know that the EU, when it was established in 1957, constituted a vast imperial polity that annexed France's and Belgium's African colonies and fully incorporated French Algeria. The founders stressed the community's huge extra-European scope and natural sphere of influence, which was designated as 'Eurafrica'. By bringing present and past into dialogue, the lecture explains why the EU's turn to geopolitics – its quest for 'strategic autonomy', its attempt stem Europe's declining global power – remains stuck in what has proven to be a very long twentieth century.

23 November (15:00-17:00): Navigating regime complexes, but how? The external dimension of EU crisis politics

Guest speaker: **Berthold Rittberger** (University of Munich)

Discussant: Michelangelo Fano

Over the past decades, the European Union (EU) has confronted multiple crises, which have required swift political responses from EU institutions and member states. While there is ample literature about the EU's internal responses to the 'polycrisis', we possess much less systematic knowledge on how the EU interacts with external actors and institutions to address crisis challenges. Since the EU does not act in an institutional vacuum, but is part of wider, issue-specific regime complexes, it has cultivated diverse relationships with other international organisations (IOs) across a multitude of issues. We assume that during periods of political crisis marked by conditions of threat, uncertainty, and urgency, IOs – including the EU – have strong incentives to complement internal crisis responses with external ones. We argue that crisis-induced interactions among IO-dyads can come in different forms: pooling, division of labor, competition and co-existence. The incidence of each of these four external crisis interactions among IO-dyads is influenced by the degree of mandate and membership overlap on the one hand, and the extent of goal convergence in response crisis-related policy challenges on the other hand. We offer an empirical mapping and analysis of the different external crisis interactions by drawing on the following crisis interactions among the EU and other IOs: pooling among the EU and International Monetary Fund (IMF) to address the sovereign debt crisis; division of labor among EU and NATO in response to Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine; competition among the EU and the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR) in the context of the migration crisis; co-existence among the EU and the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB) in the context of managing the financial fallout of the Covid-19 pandemic.

14 December (15:00-17:00): Collusion as boundary (un-)making on the EU's Eastern border

Guest speaker: **Xymena Kurowska** (Central European University)

Discussant: Andreea Tanasie

Does the current normative rift between the EU and Poland as part of the EU reveal a fundamental disagreement that undermines European integration? The paper probes this question by developing the concept of collusion that problematises dichotomic theorisation of boundary work as either integrative or conflictual. Xymena Kurowska draws on a psychoanalytical definition of collusion as a game of mutual self-deception where an actor establishes an identity for herself by achieving a particular identity for the other. Collusion shows a contextually specific dialectic of difference and commonality as core to politically effective boundary work. Empirically, the paper considers the management of the EU's Eastern border, in particular regarding migration flows, as an illustration of a collusive alliance based on reciprocal repudiations. Here, the controversies over Poland as 'a normative threat' to the declared liberal value system of the EU re-energise identities that depend upon each other within the EU project.

18 January (13:00-15:00): The EU's competing sociotechnical imaginaries of defense innovation and industry

Guest speaker: **Jocelyn Mawdsley** (Newcastle University)

Discussant: Catherine Kjaer

Martins and Mawdsley (2021) argued that from the 1960s onward, the EU gradually developed a sociotechnical imaginary around defence technology and innovation that eventually materialised in the European Defence Fund (EDF). While responding to fears about defence technological gaps with the US was one driver, it was a vision shaped by decades of comparative peace and security. Since the inauguration of the EDF, the renewed Russian invasion of Ukraine and the realities of inter-state war on the European continent have challenged this vision of the future. While Thierry Breton and other predominantly French actors have tried to adjust the vision of the EDF to what he calls a war economy, other alternatives have emerged and challenged this view. Sismondo (2020) suggests that to be analytically useful in STS, sociotechnical imaginaries need to have stability, but that, in reality, many are contested and flexible. What happens when competing sociotechnical imaginaries collide at a time when urgent decisions need to be taken that could reshape the future? The paper examines the contestation process and asks whether the sociotechnical imaginary retains analytical utility in moments of intense contestation.

1 February (13:00-15:00): Digital surveillance, platform power and the politics of asylum

Guest speaker: **Claudia Aradau** (King's College London)

Discussant: Frederik Windfeld

This talk, which is part of the "Europe in the world" seminar series, proposes to understand how specific data infrastructures – social media platforms – reshape power relations between migrants, companies and state authorities. It draws on a systematic analysis of a 'live' archive of the Upper Tribunal Immigration and Asylum Chamber decisions in UK, which contains over

38,000 decisions (until the end of 2022). This archive can be seen as integral to discourses of transparency and open government data, where data is made available to invisible publics with the aim of fostering accountability. By intersecting court decisions with an analysis of platform power, I argue that it is impossible to clarify which third parties can access data, whether data can be sold further, to whom, and how it can be recombined and reused. Platform power undoes the binaries of privacy/publicity, transparency/opacity, openness/secretcy, monitoring/indifference. Moreover, diagnoses of surveillance capitalism ignore those who have to wrangle with platform power.

29 February (13:00-15:00): 'Responding' to immigration: the militarization of Africa-EU relations

Guest speaker: **Toni Hastrup** (University of Manchester)

Discussant: Anna Reissig

Abstract: tbc

14 March (13:00-15:00): The global tech order: geopolitical imaginaries and the making of tech regulation

Guest speaker: **Rebecca Adler-Nissen** (University of Copenhagen)

Discussant: Ediz Topcuoglu

There is a growing sense that digital technologies require greater international cooperation and even global regulation. At the same time, rising tension, especially between the US and China, is making such cooperation increasingly difficult. Adding to the complication, these technologies are developed and largely owned by private companies surpassing most states in terms of resources and know-how. While the leaders of these companies often appear unequipped to discuss their own geopolitical role, their ideas matter for international security, global economy, democracy and human rights. The speaker will theorise and explore the emerging global tech order, mapping the contradictory ideologies that these different actors bring to the multi-stakeholder negotiations. Specifically, during the seminar, the geopolitical tech imaginaries – visions of the world supported by digital technologies, will be explored. How do these imaginaries get cultivated within and between tech companies, and how do they shape public discourse, national government positions and the making of tech regulation?